

6. 11
THE
CATHOLIKE
MODERATOR:
OR
A MODERATE
EXAMINATION
OF THE DOCTRINE
of the PROTESTANTS.

Prouing against the too rigid CATHOLIKES
of these times, and against the Arguments especially, of
that Booke called, *The Answer to the Catholike Apologie*, That we,
who are members of the CATHOLIKE, APOSTOLIKE, and Roman
CHURCH, ought not to condemne the PROTESTANTS for
HERETIKES, vntill further prooffe be made,

First written in French by a Catholike Gentleman,
and now faithfully translated.

*See the occasion of the name of HVGVENOTS,
after the Translators Epistle.*

The second Impression.

LONDON,
Printed for NATHANIEL BUTTER.

1623.

THE HISTORY OF THE

PROGRESS OF THE

ART OF PRINTING

IN GREAT BRITAIN

FROM THE FIRST

INVENTION OF THE

ART TO THE PRESENT

STATE OF THE ART

AND THE

PRESENT STATE OF THE

ART OF PRINTING

IN GREAT BRITAIN

FROM THE FIRST

INVENTION OF THE

ART TO THE PRESENT

STATE OF THE ART

AND THE

THE TRANSLATER TO the Christian Readers.

AND TO ALL THOSE ESPECIAL-
ly, whose hard hap it is, or may be, to be sedu-
ced onto Popery : that by the helpe of this Booke,
and their owne Prayers, they may be deliuered
from the Euill, when the Priests and Iesuits
would Leads them into temp-
tation.

Here is a bold Nation of men (the Temp-
ters aboue mentioned I meane) slyly of late
crept in amongst you (well-meaning and
abused people) whose enticements (as you
know too well) still begin with the Church ;
saying you *Protestants* are direct Hereticks,
you haue no Church : Are you therefore reconciled to the
Church ? Meaning all this time the *Romane* Church. Had
they fairely meant the Catholike Church, I know no *Calui-*
nist that hath put this Article out of his Creed, *I beleene the*
holy Catholike Church. And to say, *I beleene* : What else im-
plies it, but to beleene himsele to be of it ; else, why his
Creed ? That therefore you may make one *Romanist* to an-
swer all the rest ; doe but turne him, that would seduce you,
into these two first Chapters ; and he shall there finde, that
for those few points of Reformation, both in matter of Do-
ctrine and Ceremonie, wherein the *Protestants* haue iustly
dissented from the *Papists* ; we can be no Heretiques. And
that their owne new Doctors, who boast so much of Anti-
quitie, can no where shew our Doctrine to be sufficiently
condemned, before the time of that fifth Gospell of the *Ro-*
manists,

The Translator to the Reader.

manifests, the Councell of *Trent* I meane, which ended no more than some sixty yeeres agoe; the third Chapter will evidently shew them. And how incompetent a Iudge an Aduersarie is, and how vnlawfull a Councell that of *Trent* was, the Instances of the fourth and fifth Chapters will evince it. Lastly, that we Protestants, hauing euer continued true members of the true, holy, and Catholique Church, doe not now need any Reconciliation to theirs of *Rome*, the last Chapter will abundantly demonstrate it. Which six Chapters being written by a Gentleman, who euery where professes himselfe one of theirs, if they would offer to shift off (as they haue euasions enow) by saying that what is written in this Booke, is but the opinion of one Doctor: Loe then, we haue not only the Authors opinions, but the strength of his reasons to vrge them withall. All which are so mannerly, so directly, and so succinctly toucht vpon, and come off so handsomely, as no man (in my opinion) hath yet said better, than purposed to say so little.

To giue you therefore the minde of the Author in a word: Nothing was here written with any intention to vrge vs Protestants, any whit to depart from our Right in yeelding to a Reconciliation with them; but to perswade them rather, to esteeme better of vs: and to demonstrate withall, that if they will iudge right, they must needs thinke well. And this is the purpose of the Translator also. To shew you therefore to vnderstand all this Booke. If the Reader shall sometimes feele, that this Author now and then giues the Protestants a light fillip by the way; he shall obserue in the conclusion, that it was to reach his owne Romanists, a smarter blow; which is satisfaction enough. And that he giues vs any at all, let vs but consider, that the Author though hee were a moderate man, yet that he was withall a Papist, and it will take away much of the scandall. Lastly

which

The Translator to the Reader.

which will giue vs as much aduantage as we can desire from one man, which is to answer them by one of their owne; this Gentleman the Author *H. C.* was too well knowne here in *England* to haue continued a most zealous Roman Catholique vntill his dying day, and yet neuerthelesse are all his Reasons for moderation, directed to the Papists, as if they should first begin it; and all his conclusions directly for the Protestants, as though we should still hold them. Nay and which is somewhat more; whereas all this is with vs of *England*, common to our Brethren the Protestants of *France*, yet doth this Booke make more for vs at home, than it doth for them, for whose sakes it was first written. For though we haue with them entertained the points of Reformation; yet haue we not so far receded from the more Primitiue Roman Church (which he stands for) but that we still retaine more of the necessary Ceremonies, Solemnities, and Church Discipline, than they of *France* haue done; witnesse his second Chapter of Ceremonies; which is still for our aduantage.

As therefore this little Booke hath bene twice already printed in *France*, which is an argument of the Protestants good liking of it there; so hath it foure or fise seuerall times, both by Diuines and Gentlemen of our own Religion, been translated both into Latine and English, which is a demonstratiue Reason to me, how much it hath bene lik'd and desired. To saue therefore the labour of writing it out, which I still obserued, as many desirous to doe as could get Copies of it, I haue thought fit to let mine be published: desiring all those that light vpon it, to be as impartiall and charitable, as the Author himselfe wishes them. Which if they be, I hope well that the strictest need not bee offended, and the well-minded may reape much benefit by it. Which being my only desire, I shall euer pray for.

W. W.



THE FIRST OCCASION

how the name of HUGUENOTS,
which our Author euery where vseth,
came first to be giuen to the
French PROTESTANTS.

THere is euer some Salt as well as Gall in malice, and this
temper makes it sometimes bitterly witty; as may appeare
by this name of Huguenots, by which and no other, doe
the French Papists generally vouchsafe to call the Protestants. It
was taken vp about the yeere 1559. which was some foure or
fue yeeres before M^r. Caluins death. Till which time they were
called Tourengaux, of the Citie of Tours, where the Prote-
stants mostly vsed. But about that time, there hauing beene a
foolish opinion, of a Night-Spirits walking vp and downe the
streets, which they called King Hugon: This fancie made one
of the Citie Gates to be called King Hugons Gate; and the Pro-
testants being once obserued in the night to goe thorow that Gate
vnto their Assemblies and holy Exercises; were hereupon called
Huguenots. He that will see more of this Name, and the occa-
sion of it, may finde a handsome Discourse of it in Monsieur
Pasquiers Recherches, lib. 7. cap. 52. whither I refer you.



TO
ALL THE KINGS
FAITHFUL SVBIECTS,
and principally to those *Catholikes,*
that are desirous of the quiet of the
Church and State.

HERE are now thirty yeeres and more
(at severall times) since we haue had per-
petuall wars with the *Huguenots*, as with
Rebels and Heretikes: though we haue
perceiued of late that our former opinion
was wrongfully conceiued against them: and we may
be also mistaken in the latter; and that time, which hath
made it appeare, that they are not Rebels, may discover
likewise vnto vs, that they are not Heretikes. But howso-
euer; it were much to be wished in the meane time, that
we would entertaine a charitable conceit of them, till
there be more euidence giuen in against them.

The bitter dissention in Religion, hath beene the
spring-head of all our miseries. That was it, which
brought them forth at first, and which yet nurlseth them:
whence it is now come to passe, that those men who are

The Authors Epistle to the Reader.

at this present, disturbers of the State, haue at the very selfe-same time begun to raise tumults in the Realme, and to reuiue and exasperate the differences which we haue in Religion: In such fashion, as that the practises of the principall Leaguers, and the turbulent Sermons of diuers Preachers (for I blame not all) haue beene (as it were) *Hippocrates* twins, who went alwaies together, laught alwaies together; and it may chance, that these also may weepe together: and we haue seene the experience of it, that the tongues of the one haue done more mischiefe than the swords of the other.

See the cause then, why in the beginning of these late troubles, the Catholike Apologie hath laboured to qualifie this heat, and to confute the slanders giuen out against the Reformed Religion, and those of it. Which Apologie hath been in part refuted, but so coldly, as that no proofes which the Confuter produceth, could make me see any reason, why we should so peremptorily condemne the *Huguenots* for Heretikes, although differing from vs, about the explication of some points of Religion. Vpon which I was induc'd a yeere since & more, to answer the Reasons aforesaid. But finding the Arguments to be of great weight, I iudged it fitter to write a iust Treatise thereof by it selfe, than to answer the objections huddled vp together by another man: which hath caused me also both to suppress that which I had written already, and to defer that which I purposed to write. And longer I suppose I had deferred it, if these late Tragedies acted in the murders of our two last Kings, had not put me in the conceit of it, how that these horrid Acts sprung from the selfe-same fountaine, and that only vpon this ground too, namely, *That the Errours of*

Henry 3.

Henry 4.

the

the Huguenots are so exceedingly enormous; they found their *Maximes*, by which they perswade themselves, That a man may take any course lawfull or vnlawfull, to destroy them and their fauourers.

Another motiue I also had, which induced mee to proceed in my purpose of writing. Which was the consideration of the fortunate proceedings of our late King * HENRY (whom his enemies made to be called, Great) all the time that he continued Protestant: Then whose troubles we need seeke no further example, to shew how God both dislikes mans bloudie courses, and disposes also of his owne proceedings, his owne way. For God neuer produces any extraordinarie euent, without some extraordinarie Designe. But how extraordinarily God in the beginning fauoured his Majestie, whiles he continued Protestant, none knowes so well as his enemies, forasmuch as God made vse of their courses, for his advancement. They conceited it, that by embroyling *France* in Ciuill warres, to haue ruined him; and these warres haue increased his honour and power. They, impatient of delayes, thought presently by vniustifiable practises, to haue vrged the late King * to haue * *Henry 4.* prosecuted him with more violence, than he had done heretofore; and these plots of theirs, haue beene both the causes of the vtter ruine of his enemies, and of his reconcilment to the King. Briefly, his enemies thrust Armes into his hands for their owne destructions: and those deuices by which they had thought to haue chased him out of *Guyen*, haue brought him into the heart of *France*; and by the selfe-same meanes whereby they thought to take away his life, they haue
giuen

giuen him the Kingdome. May wee imagine that God had no designe, in the bringing about of these purposes? Or what else may wee gather out of all this; but that God is angrie, when we will not permit him to dispose of his owne Church, his owne way, but devise to prevent him by our owne wifdomes? For which respect, I protest before God, that had I beene the forest enimie that the King had had, yet should I thinke that for no other reason God had so many waies fauoured him, than to punish vs, who by vniustifiable practises out of an impatient zeale, would haue rooted out the Reformed Religion, though erroneous.

Haply then it may fall out, that if wee alter our courses, God will also change his. And as those designes of ours, by which wee verily thought to haue advanced our Religion, haue hindred it: So God also may turne the same meanes which we feared would hinder our Religion, to the aduancement of it. In the meane time let vs know thus much; That God neuer blesses those mens courses, which thinke to anticipate him through impatience. Let vs then haue patience a while; and when wee shall perceiue the times of peace to be fittest for our purposes, let vs (a Gods name) offer the same conditions vnto the *Huguenots*, which they propounded vnto vs before; which was, to assemble the best learned men in both Religions, to discusse friendly the points in controuersie; to the end, that the quiet of the Common-wealth, may goe along with that of the Church: which if the *Huguenots* shall accept of, (as I make no doubt but they will) I perswade my selfe, that there may be such a
course

course taken in the Conference, that discovery may be made of many things, which haue beene concealed hitherto from both of vs. Not that I imagine any noueltie can be found out in Religion, (God forbid that I should euer thinke so) but that the meaner questions in controuersie being reconciled, the impertinent ones omitted, the greater may be insisted vpon, to be cleared by more euident demonstrations.

Nor can either partie (considering the points be already sufficiently discussed) imagine that such a conference would be vnprofitable; for although there can hardly be found more solid Arguments, than those wherewith we haue serued our selues heretofore; yet is it one thing to proue, and another thing to satisfie: now wee must not so much maintaine a side, to vanquish, as to winne those that are in the wrong. And thus much I dare say, and I will be able to make good against any contradiction; that neither partie haue in any conference as yet taken that course, which they ought and might haue followed, for the satisfaction of the aduerse partie, and the clearing of doubts.

For mine owne part, though I be the meanest of a Million, who haue embroyled themselves in the disputes of the time, yet dare I vndertake to reduce the points in controuersie to so short an issue, and to set downe such a course for the handling thereof, that more of the truth shall be discovered in this one conference, than in all the other disputes, which haue beene since *Martin Luther* first opposed himselfe against the Pope. For both the issue shall bee so

A

drawne,

The Authors Epistle to the Reader.

drawne, and the meanes so disposed of, that the persons of neither Religion (keeping themselves to their owne proper *Maximes*) shall be able to reiect them. I should be too impudent to giue it out, if I were not well assured of my abilitie for the performance. But I am acquainted well enough with the euasions of either side, I know their fallacies, and I haue also the Art to preuent them.

But the time seemes not to be yet so fit, for wee must haue our *Spirits* quiet, as well as our *State*; and aboue all, free from that same preiudication. For if wee *Catholikes* come to a Disputation, being confident before hand, that the *Huguenots* are already condemned for Heretikes: And they on the other side, that they vnderstand the Scriptures better than *S. Austin*, and that all is cleare on their side; to what purpose serues such a Conference? The Priests and Ministers may seeme as confident as they please, for they are our Teachers; but we should not be so resolute, for we are but Learners. The end which they propose, is the Victorie; but the end which we seeke for, is the Truth. Which if wee haue found, why looke we further? But if we beleeue without searching, we may very well be deceived.

The chiefe reason then, which induced me to reassume my designe of writing in this point of Moderation, was; that our spirits being something pacified, wee might bee the better prepared to a Conference, and in that Conference make discovery of the Truth; and by discovery of the Truth, establish a Peace in the Church of God. But I suspecting mine owne insufficiencie, and fearing withall to bestow my

The Authors Epistle to the Reader.

my labour in vaine : and on the other side, being wondrously desirous to see an vnion in Religion, I chose rather to hazard that paines which I had already taken, in publishing that answer which I had made before, than to lose a new.

The reason then why I that am a *Catholike*, doe rather blame the rigour of ours against the *Huguenots*, than theirs against vs (both parties being faulty much alike) is ; because he that would reforme another, must begin at himselfe.

The importunitie and arrogancie of mine Aduersarie, vrages me sometimes to write not so like a *Catholike*, which I doe not purposely to confute the *Catholike Religion* ; but to shew only, That the errors of the *Huguenots* are not so grosse, as our side perswades themselves they are. And knowing also that no one thing hath more suppressed the Truth, than the meane esteeme that the one parte hath of the others Arguments. Which (God knowes) is meerly out of ignorance ; forsomuch as the deeper learned any man is, the more difficultie he finds in confuting his Aduersarie. For it is most certaine, that *Ignorance* engenders *Vehemencie*, and *Vehemencie* blinds vs from discouering the *Truth*. For their ignorance that are in the rights, makes those likewise the more vehement that are in the errour ; and the ignorance of those that are in errour, blinds them the more.

See then the true intent of this my Discourse : wherein though I may perchance have vsed some Reasons, which in too rigorous a Iudgement, may be esteemed with the most, in fauour of these new opinions ; yet is not my intent, with them to seduce

The Authors Epistle to the Reader.

any man, or to turne them from the Faith of their forefathers, but only to purge their spirits from preiudication vntill further prooffe be made. And if such prooffe be made (without which I conceiue no hope of vnion in the Church) I adiure thee (beloued Reader, of whether Religion soeuer thou beest) to come with a spirit void of this preiudication : Such a spirit I wish to thee, as I protest I my selfe haue; and I pray God to confirme in all of vs. *Amen.*

The Argument of the Booke.



He Catholike Apologie hath endeuoured to acquit the Huguenots of heresie by two Reasons. The first is, for that the Religion pretended to be Reformed, is not hereticall of it selfe, for that the substance of the Catholike Faith is received by the Huguenots, and that the Ceremonies which they haue reiected, were unknown to the ancient Church, of which two points, viz. Doctrine and Ceremonies, all Religion is composed. The second is, that their Religion hath not beene as yet condemned by any lawfull Iudgement: because that before the Councell of Trent, it was not condemned in any Generall Councell, and that the Councell of Trent is neither lawfull of it selfe, nor as yet approved of in France. Vpon which consideration, albeit that the Huguenots had wandred from the true faith, yet ought we not to proceed against them, as against Heretikes, vntill they haue received an arrest of condemnation, from a Generall Councell: no more than we can in iustice put a Malefactor to death, although he be notoriously culpable, vntill he be cast by the Iury, and hath had his triall.

The Author now of the Answer to this Apologie, in the second part of his booke, from the fifth Chapter to the fifteenth, traiailes hard to refute the foreJaid Reasons: in the fifth Chapter, he only propounds his Method; in the sixth, he would shew, that the Religion of the Huguenots is quite another from that of the Catholikes; in the seuenth, that the Ceremonies of the moderne Church of Rome were obserued in the Primitiue Church; in the eighth, that the Doctrine pretended to be Reformed, stands

The Argument of the Booke.

condemned by ancient Councils: in the 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. he defends the Councell of Trent; whereof the 11, 12, and 13. are to proue, that the Councell is absolutely lawfull, and the 9, 10, and 14. that it is received in France: after which method I will also diuide my defence into these six Chapters.

1. In my first, I will proue against the reasons of his first Chapter, that the Catholikes and Huguenots thus farre agree in Doctrine, that they are both of one and the same Faith and Religion.

2. In my second, against his seventh Chapter, that neither the Catholikes, nor the Huguenots, doe accord with the Primitiue Church in the matter of Ceremonies: and that for this reason the Huguenots are not to be condemned.

3. In my third, against his eighth, that before the times of the Councell of Trent, they stood not publikely and lawfully condemned.

4. In my fourth, against his 11, 12, and 13. Chapters, that the Councell of Trent is not lawfull.

5. In my fifth, against his 9, 10, and 14. Chapters, that it is not received in France.

6. In my sixth and last I will conclude, that the Huguenots may by good right be still reputed for members of the Catholique, Apostolike, and Roman Church.



CHAP. I.

That the Catholikes and Huguenots thus farre forth agree in Doctrine, that they are both of the same Faith and Religion.



It is most cleare, that men of the same Church and Religion, may differ neuerthelesse about some opinions in Diuinitie. *Austen* accords not with *Hierome*, nor *Epiphanius* with *Chrysostome*, nor *Cyprian* with *Cornelius*, nor *Irenaeus* with *Vistor*, and questionlesse one of them was in the error; yet were they all Doctors, approved by the Church, and Saints euery one of them. Euery error doth not separate a man from the Church, nor should we regard so much the number, as the qualitie of them. *Arrius* accorded with the *Catholikes* in all points but one; inso much as the change of a word, yea of one bare letter, would haue compounded the controuersie; and yet was he the greatest *ἡμωτέρω* Heretike, that euer the Church was troubled with. *Origen*, on the other side, dissented in infinite Tenents, from the other old Doctors, and was yet neuerthelesse esteemed a member of the Church. *ἡμωτέρω*

To see then, whether the *Huguenots* be of another Religion than we, neither their errors, nor their numbers is the thing which is so much to be regarded, but the nature of them only.

only is it: That is to say, what Errors are to be reputed for Heresies, and whether theirs be of that nature.

There be two things which (according to the opinion of the *Catholikes*) make Errors to proue Heresies. The one, when the Errour is of it selfe so enormous, that he is at all times an Heretike that holds it. So that euen before the *Niceane Councell* had decided it, *Ebion*, *Paulus Samosatenus*, and *Arrinus* stood then as Heretikes, for that they denied the eternall Diuinitie of the Sonne of God.

The second thing which (according to our opinion) makes an Errour to become a Heresie, is; when any man maintaines an opinion in point of Doctrine, contrary to the Decrees of a Generall Councell. So then, the Heresie lies not so much in the mischieuousnesse of the opinion, as in the resistance made against the ordinance of the Church. For example: The opinion of *S. Cyprian* touching Rebaptization, was not Heresie in him, because there was not as then any Decree of Councell made against it: But since that (say we) this opinion is condemned legally, it were flat Heresie in any other that should hold it. Of this second *Species* of Heresie, I will intreat in my third Chapter: In this, only of the former: which is; Whether the errors of the *Huguenots* be in themselves so enormous, that they destroy the very foundation of Faith, and by consequence keepe them off, from being of the same Religion with vs.

The first Reason.

Let vs see then, how our *Antagonist* takes vpon him to proue the contrary. *In the first place* (saith he) *both parties, as well the Catholikes as their Adversaries, repute one another for Heretikes.* I answer, that I finde no impossibilitie, why they may not be both deceiued. For two brothers being in choler, may well renounce one another; and yet they leaue not for all that to continue true brothers alwaies. *Cyris* and *Theodoret* accused one another for Heretiques, and yet neither of them was so. So that this reason is only drawne from the passion of men, when Reason hath abandoned them.

But how doth he proue, that the *Catholikes* repute the *Huguenots* for Heretikes, *The Catholike Church* (saith he) *hath by*
the

the Councell of Trent, condemned diuers of the Lutheran opinions. I answer (according to my first distinction) that it is one thing to returne an opinion for an heresie by condemnation; and another thing to repute it so, of its owne nature. Now whether or no the *Huguenots* be hereticks by condemnation, we will argue it hereafter in our third, fourth, and fifth Chapters. But here we dispute only of the nature of their error; wherein his proofes are nothing to his purpose. But (saith he) *At Rome euerie holy Thursday the Pope pronounces them excommunicate, and prohibits all Catholikes to reade their Bookes.* In like manner, the same day also he excommunicates all sinners; of whom hee dares not denie but that many are of the Church; else should he himselfe be condemned for an hereticke by the Councell of *Constance*, which gaue sentence against *John Hus*: That the Church consists as well of the bad, as of the good. And wherem the *Huguenots* Bookes be prohibited, so are also the Bookes of *Machiavel*, *Aretine*, and diuers other *Catholikes*.

Let vs next see the opinion which the *Huguenots* haue of the Catholike Doctrine. *Caluine* (saith he) writes that the principall points of Doctrine in the Church of *Rome*, are almost utterly abolished, and the right vse of the Sacraments in many fashions corrupted. He needs but little explication; the words themselves answer him. *Caluin* saies not, that the Sacraments are utterly taken away, but the right vse of them, many waies corrupted: Nor, that the principall points of Religion are utterly destroyed, but almost abolished. A man may be almost kild, and yet liue.

Secondly, to proue how their Religion differs from ours, The second Reason. he produces the controuersies of Originall sinne, Free-will, Iustification, Merits, and diuers others which he iudges of most consequence. It is the greatest pittie in the world to heare how the most of the Preachers in both Religions commonly fight with their owne shadowes, not vnderstanding what it is that their aduersarie holds; which comes only of the subteleries of words invented by the Deuill to disturbe the Peace of the Church. One partie vnderstanding the word

*Lindanus in pre-
fat. in Lib. de
querela pacis.*

Iustification in one sense, and another in another; one, Faith one way, and another in another; one, Grace in one fashion, another after another, and so of the rest: that which we say being true, in our acception of the word, and that which they say being likewise true, as they take it. So, that if the desire of contention were once taken away, we should soone finde, that the most of these disputes wherewith peoples eares are filled, are onely the subtleties of the Schoole, vpon the Ety- mologies and Definitions of words only. Whence it came to passe, that in the conference at *Regensburg*, the *Catholikes* and the *Protestants* fell to some agreement in the question of Originall sinne, of Predestination, Free-will, and diuers other points, which is also confessed by Bishop *Lindanus* one of the tarest enemies that the *Huguenots* euer had. Neuerthelesse the Author of this answer is so ill aduised, as to chuse out these questions principally, to shew the differences betweene them and vs.

For mine owne part, I will not take vpon me to reconcile the said questions, neither know I well (to confesse mine owne ignorance freely) whether it be possible to be done or no; only thus much I assure my selfe, that the difference is not so great as it is iudged to be. Nor will I too exactly search out the point in controuersie, because I well hope some other man may more happily performe it hereafter. Only I will discourse vpon the said questions as they are commonly vnderstood by the best Doctors in each Religion. In which sense I affirme (for ought that I haue yet seene) that the errors of the *Huguenots* are not so grosse, as that they impeach their being members of the *Catholike* Church. To cleere which point, I will reduce these questions to these four heads. 1 The *Scripture*. 2 *Iustification*. 3 *Prayer*. 4 The *Sacraments*.

1.
Scripture.

Concerning the *Scripture*, he chargeth the *Huguenots* only with one error, which is, that they reiect the Bookes of *Tobit*, *Iudith*, the *Machabees*, and the rest which they call *Apocryphall*. notwithstanding that they were approued for *Cannonicall* by the Councell of *Trent*.

To which I answer: That the *Huguenots* doe not altogether reiect them, but esteeme of them as of holy writings, and full of pietie, of greater authority than any other booke; onely they doe not state them in the same ranke with the other bookes, which are found written in the holy tongue. And this it seems to me, that *Bellarmino* after a sort accords vnto: Tom. 1. C. 11. l. 4. for that in his diuision of the Bookes of the Old Testament, he makes two Classes. In the first he rankes the bookes receiued by the *Huguenots*: And those which be called *Apocryphall*, in the second. But what though the opinion of the *Huguenots* be in this point condemned by the Councell of *Trent*; yet is the Councell of *Laodicea* cleere on their sides: And so are also *Hierome*, *Origen*, & *Nicholaus Lyra* himselfe, Cardinall *Caistane*, and many other pillars of the *Roman* Church. So that I would faine know, if that this error of the *Huguenots* be so enormous, as that for this cause they must necessarily be Heretiques; wherefore then did it not as well hinder *Hierome* from being a Saint, and Cardinall *Caistane* from being a Catholike?

Now vnder the title of Iustification, I cōprehend all the differences mentioned in the answer, which were determined in 2. Iustification. the sixth Session of the councell of *Trent*, touching 1. *The Cause*: 2. *The Matter*: 3. *The Instrument*: 4. *and the Effects of our Iustification*. By the Source or principall Cause, I meane, That disposition by which our Nature (as we Catholikes vse to say) being both preuented and accompanied by the grace of God, prepares it selfe to Iustification; that is to say, To the operation of the Free-will, which remained in man after his Fall. For the compounding of this difference, mans Free-will. Free-will must bee considered in these three estates; Before the Fall of *Adam*, after the Fall, and in the time of his regeneration, after he was againe restored. Wherein there is contained whatsoeuer is necessary for a Christian to belecue; namely, That man before the Fall of *Adam* had Free-will both to good and euill; And that by his Fall he lost the libertie to doe good: And that by Grace in his Regeneration he againe recouered it. Thus farre the *Catholikes* and the *Hu-*

Huguenots are agreed: The imaginarie controuerſie then lies on-
ly in the manner how this will is enfranchiſed or made free.
The *Huguenots* auerring, That tis the Grace of God, which
ſets it at libertie by giuing it new powers, whereof it was al-
together deſtitute before. The *Catholikes* likewiſe auerring,
that the grace of God hath ſet it at libertie, by looſing the
chaines wherewith it was before ſo captiuared, that it could
not ſet a worke the powers that it had. See here then the true
difference betweene them in this point, wherein though the
Huguenots may bee deceiued, yet is their error nothing ſo
dangerous, as to overthrow the foundation of Faith. In the
diſcuſſing of which point, we are principally to regard two
things: The Juſtice of God in puniſhing *Adam*, ſinne by
this captiuitie; and his Mercy againe in freeing vs. Now if
the *Huguenots* be in the wrong, their error is onely in aug-
menting the Juſtice and Mercie of God, by affirming, That
the freedome of our wills, is not onely bound, but ſlaine (as
it were.) Death now is a more grieuous puniſhment, than
imprisonment, and it is a greater mercie to giue life to the
will, than libertie. But what need the common people
breake their braines, about theſe Metaphors of binding and
killing, which they can neuer comprehend? Tis ſufficient
for them to know, that nothing can be done without Gods
good grace, and to ſay all with *Saint Auſten*, *To doe freely,*
comes from the Nature of man; to doe well, from Grace; but to
doe ill, from our corrupt Nature. Which ſaying, as it con-
taines the whole doctrine of Free-will, ſo is it conſented vnto,
as well by the *Catholikes* as the *Huguenots*.

The ſecond thing which I obſerued in Juſtification, is the
Matter, that is to ſay, Whether that righteouſneſſe, which is
infuſed into vs by Grace, or that of Chriſt imputed vnto vs
by Faith, be it, by vertue whereof we be iuſtified before God.
And this queſtion, though it be all one with that of Juſtifica-
tion, yet our aduerſarie, thereby to multiply the number of
his controuerſies, makes two of them, ſo deſirous hee is of
contention. Concerning which point, the *Huguenots* are in
no error in the ground and ſubſtance of the queſtion; ſo that
though

though they may be thought to differ neuer so much from vs in the circumstances, yet may they for al that be very good *Catholikes*. For example; A tree which hath the Root, Stocke & many Armes of it fount, may be a good tree though some one bough be crazed: But the *Catholikes* and the *Huguenots* are agreed vpon the Root of the question, that is to say, That there are two things necessary: That we be first quit of our Sinnes, and that wee be next indued with Righteousnesse; to put off our old garments, and re-inuest our selues with new.

1. Vpon the first, the *Catholikes* and the *Huguenots* are agreed; namely, That we are pardoned of our sinnes, and redeemed from hell, meerely by the blood of Iesus Christ.

2. Touching the second, both sides hold alike; That to be admitted entrance into heauen, we haue need of Righteousnesse, and that this Righteousnesse comes from Christ.

Now the Righteousnesse which is of Christ, is either Inherent in him, & reputed ours, or Inherent in vs, & proceeding from him; being by his grace infused into our hearts; which the *Huguenots* call Sanctification: Finally, the *Huguenots* confesse as well as the *Catholikes*, that there be indeed both these kindes of Righteousnesse, onely they differ vpon this, whether the Righteousnesse Inherent in Christ and imputed to vs, or that Inherent in vs, and proceeding from him, be it, by vertue whereof wee become iustified in the sight of God. And what is it to vs, whether another man pates our debts for vs, or giues vs money to pay it our selues? So that (in a manner) they both acknowledge the selfe same Root, the same Stocke, and the same Armes of this question, onely they cannot agree vpon the smaller Branches which grow out of these Armes. Nay more; they both acknowledge the same Branches too, but they cannot agree, vpon which of them they should roost. For the *Huguenots* confesse, that whosoever are saued, are also first sanctified; that is to say, That they haue that kinde of Righteousnesse, which the *Catholikes* call Inherent or Secondarie Righteousnesse. But they say, that they dare not build vpon it, but onely vpon that Righteousnesse, which being inherent in

Christ, is by Faith imputed to them. Seing then, that this Righteousnesse of Christ is by generall consent acknowledged to be most perfect; though there may perhaps bee thought to be some error in the *Huguenots* doctrine, yet no danger can come of it. Like as when a man laies hold on a strong bough, he may very well be deceiued in fearing another may be too weake; yet without doubt he cannot fall, so long as he embraces that which cannot breake.

The Coniunction of Faith and Grace.

Next followes the Instrument by which we embrace this Righteousnesse, and that is Faith; about the nature whereof the *Huguenots* seeme to him, to hold another error; For that *They deny* (saies he) *that Grace may be lost, without the loss of Faith.* Which is but a meere cauill of his, vpon the double signification of the word Faith. For if we affirme, That Faith is nothing else, but to beleuee that God is so and so, and that he hath done such and such things, and to be brieft, that all the Christian doctrine is most true; the *Huguenots* will say (with Saint *James*) That the deuills also beleuee as much, and that the deuills haue Faith, though without Grace. So that the *Huguenots* mistake, is nothing but in the word, for that they teach, That the Faith of that man, which is deuoid of Grace and Charitie, merites not the honourable title of a Iustifying Faith; and that such a Faith as this, is but the Instrument onely by which we are iustified, which is euer accompanied with Grace, and followed by good Workes. We affirme likewise; That a Faith without Charitie, is a Faith without Forme; wherefore, since the Forme is it, which giues the Being to the thing, it must needs follow; that a perfect Faith can haue no Being, without Charitie, which Tenet is consented vnto, both by the *Huguenots* and the *Catholikes* themselves: only we differ in termes: the *Huguenots* calling Faith without Charitie, an Historicall or dead Faith; and we, a Faith without Forme. O my God, what a pittie it is, to behold the simplicitie of our Christian Faith, thus puzzled about these quiddities.

Merit of Workes.

There remaines now the Effects of our Iustification, Good Workes: By which euen we *Catholikes* say, That a man is

not made Iust, but that being iustified before, he increases in Righteousnesse: That is, of a Iust man, he becomes more Iust; and being regenerate & in the state of Grace, He may (as our Aduersarie saies) fulfill the Law in such a sort, that he may by it truly and properly merit eternall life. But as for the fulfilling of the Law, seeing the *Huguenots* doe their best to performe it, although they may be thought to erre, in confessing they cannot doe it, yet hath our Sauour himselfe promised free pardon for it, in the Parable of the Sonne, who refused to doe his fathers will and yet did it.

To returne then to Merits by Workes, the more accurate sort of *Catholikes* peremptorily deny, that they are at all meritorious, vnlesse they be died in the blood of Christ. And I assure my selfe, that not one amongst ten thousand *Catholikes*, vnderstands sufficiently the meaning of this phrase; *Workes dyed in the blood of Christ*: but simply and without other addition they will say, That they are in good hope to merit heauen by their Workes. So that (we see) there be three seuerall opinions touching this question.

The first is of the vulgar *Catholikes*, who are more in number a thousand times, and who simply affirme; That they are indeed able to merit eternall life by their good Workes.

The second is of the *Huguenots*; who absolutely deny, That Good Workes doe merit at all; only (say they) God out of his pure Grace, for the Loue of his Sonne, grants them a recompence.

The third is the opinion of the Iesuites and the learned *Catholikes*, who deny, that any kinde of Workes doe of themselves merit, but such only (as I said) as are dyed in the blood of Christ. Which opinion accords much better with the *Huguenots* doctrine, then that of the vulgar *Catholikes*: for a thing dyed is not altered in substance, as Copper though gilded, yet continues Copper still: the tincture and the gilding making the thing onely fairer to the eye. And so is it with our Workes, which being by nature corrupt, remaine corrupt still, though dyed in the blood of Christ; howbeit that the tincture and gilding, makes them more pleasing

1.

2.

3.

Ser. 1. de annun-
tiatione Beate
Virginis.

pleasing vnto God, and for the loue which hee beares to Christs blood, to be rewarded. And if peradventure they make conscience of vsing the word *Merit*, let vs hearken to *S. Bernard*: *A man cannot* (saith he) *merit eternall life, by any good workes whatsoeuer.* And yet I trow, that *S. Bernard* was in this no *Huguenot*. For I well know, that a Iesuire with some near distinction, can make him speake like a *Catholike*, whatsoeuer his meaning was. Let vs then but doe the *Huguenots* the like courtelie, and make the same distinction in the interpretation of their *Tenent*, as we would doe in the explication of *S. Bernards*, and in this point they will proue as good *Catholikes* as *S. Bernard*, or our selues.

4.
Prayer.

The fourth point is Prayer: to wit, whether we ought to inuoke the Saints or not. The difference betwixt vs lies in two points: First, whether we ought to direct our prayers vnto them; the second, whether they pray for vs.

For the first this I say; That the *Catholikes* themselves make two extremities: to wit, in the not inuoking them, as the *Huguenots* doe; and in honouring them too much; which is to say, in attributing to them that honour, which is due only vnto God, which the Schoolemen call *Latria*, which whole euer does, they themselves hold him for an Idolater. Now the poore people which vnderstand not the Greeke, nor what *Latria* meanes, nor comprehends any other mediocrity, than to adore right downe, or not to adore at all, goes to it bona fide, and with as much deuotion, adore our Lady and the other Saints, as they doe God himselfe; in such fashion, as that very hardly (euen in the iudgement of *Catholikes*) can the *Catholikes* themselves herein auoid Idolatry.

As for the other extremity, those *Catholikes* that maintaine Inuocation of Saints, teach only thus much: That it is lawfull to inuoke them, and not vnlawfull, not to inuoke them. So that there can come no great danger of it, in following the *Catholikes* doctrine if true, nor in following the *Huguenots* though erroneous. The *Huguenots* say furthermore, that we ought to honour them; which we may very well doe without inuoking them. As a Subject may well honour his So-
ueraigne

designe being absent, though he never presented any petition to him in all his life.

As for the second point; to wit, whether they pray for vs or not: I affirme that there be *Huguenots*, that will confesse that they doe; neither doth *Caluin* himselfe deny it: only he saith, that he troubles not himselfe greatly, to know whether they doe or no. But should any of them denie it; where is the danger? *Bellarmino* that great Master of Controuersies affirms, *Tom. 1. Contr. 6. l. 3. cap. 15.* That the soules in Heauen, doe pray for the soules in Purgatory, and they in Purgatory, for those on earth. And yet notwithstanding confelleth, that *Dominicus à Soto* denieth the first, and *S. Thomas Aquinas* the second. Wherefore seeing that Purgatory is more beneficiall to the Pope than Paradise, I can perceiue no reason wherefore the *Huguenots* should rather be Heretiques for disagreeing with the *Catholikes* about the Intercession of the Saints in Heauen, than the *Catholikes* are for differing amongst themselves about the Intercession both of the soules, and for the soules in Purgatory.

The last point wherein the *Huguenots* are departed from the Roman faith is, touching the Sacraments; wherein the number, nature, and particular Sacraments are to be considered of. And they first miscount themselves in the number, reckoning but two, whereas the Councell of *Trent* hath concluded it, that there are seven. Which obiection of his is but frivolous; inasmuch as the difference lies more in the words, than in the thing. For taking the word *Sacrament* properly, *S. Austin* saith, that there be but two, that is to say, Baptisme, & the Eucharist. Further, it is an ordinarie phrase amongst vs *Catholikes* to say, That all the Sacraments issued out of our Saviours side: whereas there issued nothing from thence saue water and blood, which according as *Chrysostome*, *Cyril*, and other Ancients interpret it, represent the two Sacraments: that is, Baptisme by the water, and the Cup of the Lords Supper, by the blood. To which our *Catholike* Doctors giue no other answer than this: That the two Sacraments haue some kinde of dignity about the rest; which comes to no more than to say, that there be two principall Sacraments, and five more, inferior to those two. Which is all one with the *Huguenots* opinion,

5.

The Sacraments and their number.

nion, though in diuers termes. They say that there be but two properly; we say that there be but two principally: We againe, that there be siue more of an inferiour order; they confesse that there may be more, if we meane of Sacraments in the generall signification.

For Caluin yeelds, that Order is a Sacrament, but not common to all men, nor will our *Catholike* Doctors say otherwise. Againe, they will confesse with *S. Paul*, that Mariage is also a Sacrament, taking it in that generall signification wherein the Ancients haue translated the Greeke word. Briefely, they will yeeld that there be seuen, but not barely seuen. And in truth there was none of the Ancient Fathers, that euer light vpon this number of seuen. So that though the *Huguenots* cannot so euently iumpe vpon the number, seeing the Primitiue Church could nor doe it; wee may perchance condemne them of ignorance in Arithmeticke, but their errour in Theologie cannot be so great.

The difference
betwixt our Sa-
craments, and
those of the
old Law.

But he may argue, that they are mistaken in the very nature of the Sacraments; because they deny them to be distinguished in force and vertue, from the Sacraments of the old Law, or that they confer grace. I answer: That this is a meere slander; for the *Huguenots* doe distinguish them from the Sacraments of the old Testament; and doe affirme, that they doe also confer grace. What would you desire more of them? But not (saith he) *ex opere operato*. The difference then is not in the matter, whether our Sacraments confer more grace, or are of more efficacie, than those of the old Law; but in the manner only, by what meanes this grace is conferred. As for the manner, we should not methinks too narrowly pricke into it, as *Belarmine* very sagely aduiseeth vs. Like as in *Christs* miracles (saith he) the parties that were healed, needed not to inquire in what manner the garment of *Christ* did cure them, it being sufficient to them to beleene onely, that the touch of it wrought the cure: iust so is it not necessary (saith he) that the Ministers or the Receiuers of the Sacraments should be curious to know, in what manner they become the causes of our Iustification.

Tom. 2. cont. 1.
lib. 2. cap. 1.

The efficacie
of Baptisme.

We come next to the particular Sacraments, whereof hee makes mention but of three only: That is to say, Baptisme,

the

the Sacrament of the Altar, and Penance. Touching Baptisme, they affirme, saith he, *That Originall sinne stickes so close to man, that neither by Baptisme, nor any other remedie, can it be gotten off.* I answer: That euen the *Huguenots* confesse as freely as the *Catholikes*, that a man is washed from Originall sinne by Baptisme, which is enough for a Christian to beleeue in this point: so that the difference lies merely in the nicitie of the word, whether it should rightlie be called Sinne, or no Sinne: The *Catholikes* holding, that the Sinne is so farre remitted, that the concupiscence which remaines, ought not to be called Sinne: The *Huguenots* affirming, that the remaining Concupiscence may very well be called Sinne, although they herein consent to the *Catholikes*, That a man is so clearely absolued and discharged of it, that it is not reputed as a Sinne. For which cause in no other sense doe they deny the grace receiued in Baptisme, though they still esteeme themselves sinners altogether, than the Debtor doth his Creditours mercie; who confessing that he hath received the fauour of him, to haue his debts forgiven, doth neuerthelesse acknowledge himselfe his debtor. Which way soeuer it be taken, the sinner is pardoned, and the debtor discharged, and what need haue we to desire more?

He may say perchance againe: That the *Huguenots* erre not so much in acknowledging the benefits receiued in Baptisme, because they are not so well aware of the danger that followes the want of it: For they affirme (saith he) that the Children of Christians may be esteemed righteous, and haue admittance into the kingdome of heauen without Baptisme, notwithstanding that Iesus Christ hath said, That whosoever is not borne againe of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdome of heauen: I answer: That the *Huguenots* affirme not, that euery childe borne of Christian Parents dying without Baptisme is saued, but those only whom God in his eternall counsell hath elected. So that the question is not so much about Baptisme, as about Gods election: wherein there can be no danger, to confesse our ignorance, referring still Gods owne decrees to his owne good pleasure, as the *Huguenots* doe. For they instance not in what children are elected, but forbear to presse into Gods cabiner, and out of that to pronounce, that such and such children shall be saued,

Of Infants dying without Baptisme.

nion, though in diuers termes. They say that there be but two properly; we say that there be but two principally; We againe, that there be siue more of an inferiour order; they confesse that there may be more, if we meane of Sacraments in the generall signification.

For *Caluin* yeelds, that Order is a Sacrament, but not common to all men, nor will our *Catholike* Doctors say otherwise. Againe, they will confesse with *S. Paul*, that Mariage is also a Sacrament, taking it in that generall signification wherein the Ancients haue translated the Greeke word. Briefely, they will yeeld that there be seuen, but not barely seuen. And in truth there was none of the Ancient Fathers, that euer light vpon this number of seuen. So that though the *Huguenots* cannot so euently iumpe vpon the number, seeing the Primitiue Church could not doe it; wee may perchance condemne them of ignorance in Arithmeticke, but their errour in Theologie cannot be so great.

The difference
betwixt our Sa-
craments, and
those of the
old Law.

But he may argue, that they are mistaken in the very nature of the Sacraments; because they deny them to be distinguished in force and vertue, from the Sacraments of the old Law, or that they confer grace. I answer: That this is a meere slander, for the *Huguenots* doe distinguish them from the Sacraments of the old Testament; and doe affirme, that they doe also confer grace. What would you desire more of them? But not (saith he) *ex opere operato*. The difference then is not in the matter, whether our Sacraments confer more grace, or are of more efficacie, than those of the old Law; but in the manner only, by what meanes this grace is conferred. As for the manner, we should not me thinks too narrowly prie into it, as *Belarmine* very sagely aduiseeth vs. Like as in *Christs* miracles (saith he) the parties that were healed, needed not to inquire in what manner the garment of *Christ* did cure them, it being sufficient to them to beleene onely, that the touch of it wrought the cure: insi so is it not necessary (saith he) that the Ministers or the Receiuers of the Sacraments should be curious to know, in what manner they become the causes of our Iustification.

Tom. 2. cont. 1.
lib. 2. cap. 1.

The efficacie
of Baptisme.

We come next to the particular Sacraments, whereof hee makes mention but of three only: That is to say, Baptisme, the

the Sacrament of the Altar, and Penance. Touching Baptisme, they affirme, saith he, *That Originall sinne stickes so close to man, that neither by Baptisme, nor any other remedie, can it be gotten off.* I answer: That euen the *Huguenots* confesse as freely as the *Catholikes*, that a man is washed from Originall sinne by Baptisme, which is enough for a Christian to beleue in this point: so that the difference lies meerely in the nicitie of the word, whether it should rightliest be called Sinne, or no Sinne: The *Catholikes* holding, that the Sinne is so farre remitted, that the concupiscence which remaines, ought not to be called Sinne: The *Huguenots* affirming, that the remaining Concupiscence may very well be called Sinne, although they herein consent to the *Catholikes*, That a man is so clearly absolved and discharged of it, that it is not repured as a Sinne. For which cause in no other sense doe they deny the grace receiued in Baptisme, though they still esteeme themselves sinners altogether, than the Debtor doth his Creditours mercie; who confessing that he hath receiued the fauour of him, to haue his debts forgiven, doth neuerthelesse acknowledge himselfe his debtor. Which way soeuer it be taken, the sinner is pardoned, and the debtor discharged, and what need haue we to desire more?

He may say perchance againe: That the *Huguenots* erre not so much in acknowledging the benefits receiued in Baptisme, because they are not so well aware of the danger that followes the want of it: For they affirme (saith he) *that the Children of Christians may be esteemed righteous, and haue admittance into the kingdome of heauen without Baptisme, notwithstanding that Iesus Christ hath said, That whosoever is not borne againe of water and of the Holy Ghost, be cannot enter into the kingdome of heauen*: I answer: That the *Huguenots* affirme not, that euery childe borne of Christian Parents dying without Baptisme is saued, but those only whom God in his eternall counsell hath elected. So that the question is not so much about Baptisme, as about Gods election: wherein there can be no danger, to confesse our ignorance, referring still Gods owne decrees to his owne good pleasure, as the *Huguenots* doe. For they instance not in what children are elected, but forbear to presse into Gods cabiner, and out of that to pronounce, that such and such children shall be saued,

Of Infants dying without Baptisme.

And if he replies againe, That the Election of God is neuer destitute of these secundarie meanes, and that Baptisme is the means, by which he saues those that are elected; and that it is a most manifest signe, that those who are deprived of this Baptisme, are also deprived of that election: I answer, That there bee *Catholikes*, who teach, that a man may bee saued without these secundarie meanes. *S. Damascene*, *S. Brigid*, and some other *Catholikes* doe hold, that the Emperour *Trajan*s soule was deliuered out of Hell by the prayers of *S. Gregory*, notwithstanding that he died a *Pagan*, and without Baptisme. If they then be not Heretiques, that teach the mercy of God to be so great, that he saued one who had sinned actually, notwithstanding that he died without Faith, and without Baptisme; why should it be accounted Heresie, to say, that he sometimes saues little Innocents, who neuer had more than Originall Sin? For it is a more extraordinary thing, to draw one out of Hell, than to keepe one from going thither. And what fauour God had shewen to one, he may likewise shew to many.

As for that text of *S. Iohn*, *Regenerate of water and of the Holy Ghost*, it is to shew, that the ordinary meanes vnto saluation, is to conioyne the outward signe to the inward grace, according to *S. Paul*s saying, *That with the heart man beleeueth vnto righteousness, & with the tongue he confesses to saluation*: which shewes thus much; that ordinarily the outward confession goes with the inward affection; nor can it be inferred out of the former text, That faith can neuer be without the confession of the mouth, no more than it can by the other; that Grace cannot be without the washing of the body.

Finding now no great matter in the *Huguenots* Doctrine to blame worthy about the Baptisme of Christ; hee descendeth to the Baptisme of *Iohn*: which in the *Huguenots* opinion differs not at all from that of Christ. To which I answer; That all the *Huguenots* hold not this opinion: Secondly, that this difference is of no such great importance, because that they that hold it, doe it not to derogate from the Baptisme of Christ; for that they esteeme it not *Iohn*s Baptisme, but Christs, administred by *Iohn*, before Christs declaring of himselfe, as it was by the Apostles afterwards. Finally, all this dispute is not about Christs Baptisme which the people receiue, but about *Iohn*s, which they receiue not; and consequently it matters not much, to vnderstand the force and efficacie of it.

In the next place follows the Sacrament of the Altar, which Transubstantiation, comprehends two differences propounded in the answer. Which be, Christs presence in it; and the Sacrifice of the Masse. Upon the first the *Huguenots* are accorded with the *Catholikes* in the thing it selfe; that is, That our Saviour is truly present in the holy Sacrament, and that we doe eat his body, and drinke his blood. The difference only lies in the manner, how he is present, & how we eat and drinke him. Which errorre cannot touch the foundation of Faith, forasmuch as, according to our *Catholike* Doctors opinion, it was left free for euery man, by the space of 1000 yeeres after Christs death, to beleue this presence of his, in what manner they thought best, provided that they beleue it at all. Whence it is manifest, that it is but the *Huguenots* ill luck to liue in such a rigorous age of the Church, otherwise they should not for this haue bene heretickes. For diuers of the ancient Fathers were infected with this errorre. *Theodoret*, yea and *Gelasius* too, who was also Pope, haue written in expresse words, That euen after the Consecration of these holy Mysteries, the very nature and substance of the bread remained still. True it is that the *Huguenots* may well be silent for reuiving of this errorre, when they see that the Church of *Rome*, and which is more, the Pope himselfe hath condemned it; neuertheless seeing that *Gelasius*, who was likewise a Pope, held the verie same errorre; we *Catholikes* should doe well to qualifie it all we can, for the reparation of the Sea *Apostolique*.

*Theod. Dialog.
Gelasius lib. de
duabus naturis.*

Now for the Sacrifice of the Masse, they both confesse with *S^t. Paul*, that there is but one Sacrifice for sinne, namely, that one of Iesus Christ vpon the Crosse; in such sort, that the *Catholikes* asseuerme not, that they make any new Oblation, but only represent that former one, so oftentimes ouer, as they celebrate the *Eucharist*, in which Christ is continually offered vp. But forasmuch as *S^t. Paul* teaches, That there is not only but one Sacrifice, but also that Iesus Christ is but once offered: this Doctrine of ours had need be verie subtilly interpreted, which no man in my iudgement could finelier doe than *S^t. Thomas Aquinas*, who saith, That this Sacrament is named an Immolation of Christ, in two regards, the first, for that (as *S^t. Austin* saith) Signes are called by the names of the things whereof they be Signes: the second, for that by vertue

*The Sacrifice
of the Masse.*

Heb. 7. 10.

Thomas part.

of this Sacrament, we are made partakers of the death of Iesus Christ. Well, let vs see then how farre the *Huguenots* accord with *S^t. Thomas* in these two manners of the offering vp of Christ Iesus. For the first, seeing that it is collected out of *S^t. Austen*, let vs heare him in his owne words. He falsifies not (saith he) who saies that Iesu Christ is offered vp euery day, for if the Sacraments had not a kinde of resemblance of the things whereof they be Sacraments, they could not be Sacraments at all; and by reason of this resemblance, they ordinarily take the names of the things themselves. According to which interpretation the *Huguenots* will also say, that Christ is offered vp in the Sacrament, for as much as the Sacraments haue the name of the things which they signifie. And seeing that the Eucharist signifies the death of Christ, a man may well giue the same terme to the Eucharist, which he does to his death. And for as much as he was offered vp by his death, the *Huguenots* will confesse likewise, that he is also offered vp in the Eucharist, by reason (as *S. Austen* saith) of this resemblance betweene them.

Concerning the second respect, for which *S. Thomas* saies, that the Eucharist is called the *Immolation* of Iesus Christ, that is, for that in the Sacrament we are made partakers of the death of Iesu Christ; the *Huguenots* will also agree thereunto. For it is their common phrase of speech to say, that in this Supper they are made partakers of the death and passion of Iesus Christ. Now if there be any third way of offering, questionlesse it is no matter of any great importance; for that *S. Thomas* was so good a Catholike, and so subtile a Logician, and aboue all, so experienced in the distinctions and other stratagems of the Schoole, would neuer haue made mention barely of two manners of offerings, had there beene any third of any consequence.

Penance.

The last Sacrament which he instances in, is *Penance*, wherein the Author of the Answer obserues no difference, but only names it in that fashion, that I cannot see what fault he finds in the *Huguenots* Doctrine. But to picke out his meaning, I trow, that the difference lies principally in two points: That is to say, Whether this *Penance* be well called a Sacrament, or not; and secondly, What be the parts of it. For the first point, of the title of Sacrament; It is but a wrangling about the word, as I haue shewed before, when I discoursed of the number of the Sacraments. As for the

the parts; Namely, *Contrition*, *Confession*, and *Satisfaction*, if that he blames the *Huguenots* for not holding them properly parts thereof; I answer him, That neither doe all *Catholikes* hold them so: For *Durandus* makes but two parts, *Confession* and *Absolution*, and *Scotus* saies, that there is but one, which is *Absolution*.

But if the question be whether these three things bee requisite or not, the *Huguenots* will also say that they are; to wit, that it is necessary for a Penitent to haue *Contrition* and sorrow of heart, to confesse and acknowledge our sins vnto God, nay, and that it is profitable also to confesse them to the Pastors of the Church, but not so absolutely necessarie: because (according to the iudgment of the learned *Catholikes*) this Auricular Confession was neuer instituted by God, nor yet of a long time practised in the Church; as *Beatus Rhennanus*, who was himselfe a *Catholike*, hath very well obserued.

In Annotat. ad
lib. Tertul. de po-
nitentia.

Finally, as for *Satisfaction*, it is to be considered either in this life, or in the life to come in Purgatory. That in this life, the *Huguenots* approue of, and teach it to bee most necessary to Saluation, to giue satisfaction to men whom we haue any way offended, and in regard of our sins against God, to walke in newnesse of life. Moreouer, they confesse that God punisheth men in this life by temporall afflictions, yea euen those whose sins are pardoned.

'Tis true indeed, that they deny any satisfaction or punishment to be in Purgatory after death for sinne: but herein their error cannot be great; first because *S. Austen* puts it down no otherwise than as a thing probable and not necessary, saying no more, but, *It may be that it is true*. And secondly, because that neither can the *Catholikes* agree vpon it amongst themselves; some of them placing Purgatory here vpon earth, others vnder it; some neither aboue, nor below, but in the Aire. Some affirme, that all the elect shall goe thither, yea the Apostles and Martyrs themselves; others thrust in those only, who haue not in this life giuen full satisfaction for their sins. And for the fire, some would haue it a Materiall fire; some, fire and water; others, neither of both. Lastly, some there be that teach, that the soules are there tormented by Devils; others, by Angels, others by neither of both. How then I pray is this questiō likely to be so necessary, about w^{ch} there is so much vncertainy, that

Purgatorie.

Lib. 21. de Civ.
Dei, cap. 26.

that we neither know (as I haue shewed) who they bee that goe thither, nor where it is, nor by whom they are to bee tormented, nor what they are to suffer. The difference then betwixt the *Catholikes* and the *Huguenots*, is but this; That the *Huguenots* beleene it not at all, and the *Catholikes* know not what they beleene.

See here in brieft the *Huguenots* opinions vpon the points before mentioned, by which wee may perceiue their errors not to be in the substance of Faith, and doe not therefore hinder them from being of the Church and *Catholike* Religion. For euery error in Theologie doth not separate a man from the Church. *Cyprian* was an Anabaptist in the point of Rebaptization, and yet was he a Martyr. *S. Hierome* (as I said before) held those bookes of Scripture for Apocryphall, which the Councell of *Trent* hath since concluded to be Canonically, and yet remains he still Canonized for a Saint. *Tertullian* one of the ancient Fathers fell to be a Montanist: And *Origen* alone held as many errors, as all the *Huguenots* together; yet was he one of the most famous Doctors of the whole Church. And to come neerer to our times; In how many questions of Diuinitie did *Scotus* and *Thomas Aquinas* differ, the two prime pillars of Schoole-Diuinitie? *Melchior Canus* and *Bellarmino* accuse *Caietane* of diuers errors, who for all that remains one of the venerable Colledge of Cardinals. The *Dominicans* and *Franciscans* could neuer yet agree about our Ladies conception, yet be both of them held for very good *Catholikes*. So that, as I said, the *Huguenots* may very safely bee accounted good *Catholikes*, so long as they hold the foundation of Diuinity, although they put some few tyles out of order on the rooffe of the house, and build with hay and straw: vpon condition still, that (as *S. Paul* saith) it be vpon the same foundation. Otherwise we must conclude, the Martyrs, the Saints, the ancient Fathers, the Doctors of the Church, the prime Schoolemen, the Cardinals, yea and the *Catholikes* themselues, to be no *Catholikes*.

CHAP. 2.

That the Catholikes as well as the Huguenots doe not agree with the ancient Church in matter of Ceremonies: and that therefore the Huguenots are not to be condemned.



In men we consider their bodies, and their apparell; so in the Church likewise wee consider the Doctrine, and the Ceremonies. As for the Doctrine or bodie of Religion, I haue showne in the former Chapter, that the Huguenots haue the braine, the heart, and the liuer, and all other the vitall parts, whole and sound: that is, that they yet hold all the principall points of faith, and that the maine thing that can seeme to be blamed in them, is, that they haue some certaine warts or spots in their skinne; certaine errors I meane, in the circumstances and application of that faith. Now for the apparell and ceremonie of Religion, I confesse that the Church of the Huguenots is not so gorgeously or richly set out, as the Church of Rome, and is for the same cause not so well entertained, and more despised in the Courts of great Princes and Monarchs of the world: which I iudge to be the reason why the Catholike Apologie endeoured to excuse the simple and naked Ceremonies of the Reformed Church, without any intent thereby to disparage the gorgeous and gay attire of the Catholike Church; but to shew onely, That we should not so meanly esteeme this outward simplicitie, as to condemne it without hearing. Euen as that Officer would be held too rigid and seuer, that would hinder a poore man from presenting his Petition to the Prince, because he is not clad like a Courier.

The reason for which the Apology doth excuse them, is, for that the ancient Church did sometimes heretofore content herselfe with the like simplicitie. Now vpon this occasion the Author of the answer perswades himselfe that he hath gotten

ten a great aduantage vpon the Catholike Apologie: Because (saith he) he can proue, that diuers of these ceremonies which the Huguenots doe reiect are very ancient: To which I answer, That I willingly accept as much as he grants, that is, that he cannot proue that *all* the ceremonies of the Church of Rome be most ancient, but only (as he saith) *diuers* of them. As for those diuers which he instanceth in, that you may see how impertinent they are, I will make it appeare in these two things: First, that he doth not proue against the Huguenots, that the Church of Rome doth agree with the ancient Church in the selfe-same ceremonies. Secondly, that admitting that the ancient Church had them in vse, yet are not the Huguenots to be condemned for hauing disused them.

That the Church of Rome agrees not with the Primitiue Church in matter of Ceremonies.

For the first point: my purpose is not to condemne the ceremonies of our Mother the holy Church, but since that our side are so strait laced, as to hinder our reconciliation for a thing so indifferent as these ceremonies are; I haue taken the boldnesse to oppose them: and to shew, That the Huguenots may easily answer the argument which he alledges: which I write not to iustifie them, but with a purpose that we should not so confidently assure our selues, that all is so cleare on our sides. Let vs heare then how the Huguenots may answer the fiftene Examples which he bringeth.

The
Signe of the Crosse.

The first example is the *signe of the Crosse*: concerning which, the Huguenots will confesse that it hath beene anciently vsed; but that the vse of this was brought into the Church, vpon a particular occasion, and proper only to that age. For the Pagans, amongst whom the Christians in those daies conuersed, were wont, when they met with a Christian, to make the signe of the crosse in derision of their Christianitie, for that the God whom they worshipped was hanged vpon a crosse; so that the Christians, to shew that they were not ashamed of such a death, in all their actions would still make the signe of the crosse. But now this occasion being taken away, the Huguenots may likewise say, that it is not necessary to continue the practice no more than it is to apply a plaister to a wound already healed.

As for *praying to the East*: I never yet knew any Huguenot that

char held it vnlawfull to pray towards the East, nor any Catho-
like that thought it vnlawfull to pray also toward other quar-
ters of the world. What more then is there to be said between
them, but only that it is an indifferent custome, which hath
not bene alwaies so strictly obserued in all Churches. For So-
crates saich, that in the Church of *Antioch*, the high Altar was
placed cleane contrary, and towards the West.

2.
Praying to-
wards the East.

Lib. 5. cap. 21.

As for the *innocation of the Eucharist*, our aduersarie affirms,
that it appeareth by *Saint Basil*, That this *innocation* was then
and from the *Apostles* time practised, when they shewed the Eu-
charist. I answer, that these words make nothing against the
Huguenots, for a man may very well vse *innocation* in the
time of the celebration of the Sacrament, and all the while di-
rect his *innocation* to God, and not to the Sacrament. True
it is, that there was a speciall Prayer appointed for that pur-
pose, which *Saint Basil* thought to haue bene a tradition of
the *Apostles*: But now the Catholikes themselues doe not any
longer obserue that forme of prayer: and it cannot be found
in any antiquitie, what forme of prayer that was, which *Saint*
Basil speaks of. So that if this prayer were an *Apostolicall*
Tradition, our Church hath had small care in preserving it;
which made me beleue that we haue some things put vpon
vs vnder the title of *Apostolicall* Tradition, which are not so.
For it is still as easie to inuent some new Tradition, which we
haue not yet receiued, as to forget those which we haue alrea-
dy entertained. For God ordinarily where he takes away the
memory, supplies that defect with inuention and sufficiencie
of iudgement. It being very wisely done, when we haue lost
one Tradition, to put another in the place, thereby to keepe
the number full still, and entire.

3.
Inuocation of
the Eucharist.

The fourth example is of *Hallowing the water in Baptisme*.
Now the Huguenots will confesse with *Saint Basil*, that the
water of Baptisme ought to be blessed: But this they denie;
that this hallowing was such heretofore, as that now in vse
with vs. For as much as they say, That water and all other
creatures are sanctified by God already: and particularly that
the water of Baptisme needs no benediction to make it more
holy;

4.
Blessing of the
water in Bap-
tisme.

Hamil. 25. in
Joban.

holy; because (as saith Saint *Chrysostome*) Christ by his Baptisme hath blessed all waters. But if my Antagonist will proceed further to inferre, that the water in Baptisme ought of necessitie to be hallowed in the same sort that it is now; I say, that *Eusebius* writes, that *Constantine* the Great would haue men to baptise in Iordan; and yet I neuer heard that all the water of Iordan was made holy water.

5. 6.
Consecration
and vse of Oyle
in Baptisme.
*Tertull. lib. de
corona militie.*

They will say as much of the consecration of the Oyle. The word *Consecration* at the first, signifying no more than the institution of a signe to an holy vse. And as for the vse of Oyle, like as the ancient Church made vse of it in Baptisme, so did they also of milke and honie; neither of which are any more in vse, no nor in the Roman Church. Why then should the Huguenots be blamed more for the want of one ceremonie, than the Catholikes would be for want of another? And this also serues to disproue that other example which followes, to wit, that the Roman Church agreeth with the ancient in all the ceremonies of Baptisme.

7.
Lent.
*Epiphani. heres.
75.*

His next example is of the Fast in *Lent*, which Saint *Hierome* esteemes for an Apostolicall tradition. To which the Huguenots will answer, that *Epiphanius* saith, That it is an Apostolicall Tradition also to fast vpon Wednesdaies and Fridayes, except vpon those betwixt Easter and Whitsontide: in which time the said *S. Hierome* in the very booke quoted by the Answerer, saith, That it is vnlawfull to fast: and yet do the Catholikes fast notwithstanding vpon Fridaies in that very time. Why then are the Huguenots more to be blamed for disusing the custom of the ancient Church in the obseruation of the forty daies before Easter, than the Catholikes, for dissenting from the same Church, in the obseruation of the 50 daies after?

8.
Sacrifice for
the dead.

Concerning the sacrifice for the dead, it appeares by that Liturgie of the Greekes, which is read in the fifth Tome of Saint *Chrysostomes* workes, that they made mention amongst the dead (for whom they made their oblations) of the Apostles and Martyrs; who according to the iudgement of all parties, doe goe directly into heauen, and haue no need of any such oblation as men offer at this day, for the easing of the soules departed.

departed. So as the Huguenots will say, that it must needs follow, that the soules of the Saints which are in Paradise are holpen by such oblations, (which none of the wiser Catholikes will maintaine) or else that the said sacrifice for the dead was no other thing than a *Commemoration* made in the time of the Celebration of the Eucharist; and thus much the wiser sort of Huguenots will not finde fault withall.

The next example is of the *Baptisme of Infants*: which the Huguenots allow of as well as the Catholikes.

As for the mixing of water with the wine in the Chalice, this in the iudgement of the better learned Catholikes, is not a thing so necessarily required. And why then should we blame the Huguenots for omitting this ceremonie? In like manner, the better learned amongst the Huguenots will confesse that it is lawfull: and why then should they blame the Catholikes for obseruing it? That which is not necessarie may lawfully be omitted, and that obserued which is lawfull.

Another example is of *perpetuall single lifes*, which the Huguenots blame not: but they will say, that the obseruation of it in those times was voluntary, and not constrained; & that men were neuer compelled to vow it, as appears by the very Canons themselves. *The Church* (saith one Canon) *after the constitution of the Apostles, added some counsell of perfection, as this of the single life of Priests*: where we may obserue 2. things against the answer, one is, that single life was ordained by way of counsel, not of commandment; the other, that it was ordained since the Apostles times, and could therefore be no tradition of the Apostles.

The next example is of the *solitarie or contemplatiue life*; which the Huguenots will not absolutely condemne: but they may well say that it hath beene in times past, much different from this of our Hermites and Anchorites at this day. For they which first brought in this manner of liuing, obserued it onely in the time of persecution, to auoid Idolatry, and all other occasions of being enforced to vnlawfull actions by the tyrants which then ruled: as the Ecclesiasticall stories do testifie in the liues of *S. Paul* and *S. Anthony*, the two first Hermits.

Now for the *order of Monkes*: the Huguenots will name the

9.
Baptisme of Infants.

10.
Mixture of water with the wine in the Chalice.

11.
Perpetuall single life.

12.
Solitarie life.

See men, Histor. lib. 1. cap. 12.

13.
Orders of Monkes.

*Athanasius ad
Draconium.*

14.

Election of
Meats.

the very yeere when each of them was inuented. And what though the name of Monks was vsual in the primitiue Church; yet were they then other manner of Monks, than ours at this day. For first, they earned their liuings by the sweat of their browes. Secondly, diuers of them were married, as *Athanasius* writes. Finally, the Huguenots will say, that there was neuer Monke in the Primitiue Church that killed a King; nor any Catholike in those times, that would haue approued it.

There remaines the *election of meats*; which the Huguenots approue, so that it be done with discretion, and not meerly for conscience, according to the custome of the ancient Church. For the better clearing of this point, wee may (me thinks) distinguish betweene the difference of meats, and the choice of meats. For the Huguenots will say, that there is no difference of meats in respect of Religion; for that it is lawfull to eat indifferently of all sorts of meats, without making scruple of Conscience; but that men for the taming of their flesh may abstaine from such meats, as they finde to prouoke them to concupiscence: which kinde of abstinence because it is left free to the choise of him that fasteth, may properly be called, *Election of meats*. For the Apostles (saith the Ecclesiasticall Story) haue left it to euery mans liberty, to vse as well in their fasts, as on other dayes, such kinds of meats as they best like of. Whereas the Fastes enioyned by the Church of Rome, may rather (will the Huguenots say) be called, *A prescription of meats*, than a free *Election*: because Election is still voluntary, and their abstinence is constrained.

Tripartite 9. 38.

15.

Holy-daies.

Lib. 5. cap. 21.

Finally, concerning *Holy-daies*, which they call an Apostolicall Tradition, I say, that the Ecclesiasticall Stories shew the cleane contrary: For *Socrates* saith in expresse words, *That the Apostles ordained nothing concerning Holy-daies*. Again, they which supposed them to haue beene ordained by the Apostles, are enforced at length, to place the obseruation of them in the Classe of things indifferent. For of all the Festiual daies, there was not one of them which hath beene obserued with more deuotion than Easter day; which notwithstanding the Western Church vsed to celebrate vpon Sunday, and the Eastern

Easterne, vpon other daies: the one confirming their custome by the tradition of *S. Peter* and *Paul*, and the other by the tradition of *Philip* and *Iohn*. Which controuersie, was thus taken See 7. 19.
vp betwixt *Polycarpus* and *Victor* Bishop of Rome; namely, that the obseruation of it should be left free and indifferent. Now the Huguenots doe not simply condemne the obseruation of Holy-daies, but only the forcing to the obseruation of them. For in England, Germany, Switzerland, and other Countries, where the pretended Reformed Religion is established, they to this day obserue diuers Saints daies, without reprehension of the Huguenots in France.

But put the case, that the vse of all the foresaid Ceremonies were such in the ancient Church, as they now are in the Roman; yet say I, that all these examples make nothing to the purpose; For as much as Ceremonies (as I haue said) are but the apparell, which alters the fashon euery foot, and are fitted to time and place: which our Aduersary himselfe confesseth. For, knowing that the most part of our Ceremonies were vknowne to the Ancients, he hath no other Answer than this, which will also serue to answer him againe, *viz.* That it matters not much, whether the Ecclesiasticall Ceremonies were in vse in the Primitiue Church, or were newly taken vp in these latter times. Now the Scriptures (will the Huguenots say) denounce the same curse against those which adde, as against those which take away: so that if it be lawfull for the Romane Church to adde any thing to the ancient Ceremonies, it is as lawfull for them also to take away, especially those which haue beene added.

Secondly, the Church is called Primitiue, either in regard of it selfe, because it is truly ancient; or in respect of the moderne Church of Rome, as it is more ancient in its selfe. If we speake now of the Church, as it is ancient in it selfe; the Huguenots will say, that there is no resemblance betwixt the Ceremonies of the ancient Church, and those of the moderne. But if wee speake of that which is more ancient than ours, (from which only our Aduersaries Arguments are drawne) they will say, that (besides all this, that the most part of our Cere-

That the Huguenots are not to be blamed for leauing off the Ceremonies of the ancient Church.

Eph. 119.19.

Ceremonies are different) yet at that time also were there too many in the Church; in so much as Saint *Augustine* in his time complained exceedingly of the multitude of them.

Finally, as the ancient Church had some Ceremonies, which the Huguenots haue not; so had it likewise others, which the Church of Rome hath not; as Milke and Honey in Baptisme, and the fashion of plunging the Infant thrice to the bottome: which haue beene abrogated (as Saint *Thomas* saith) to auoid the calumnies of the Sabellians; who for this custome reproched the Christians, that they worshipped three Gods. From whence we may collect, how indifferent things these Ceremonies are, so long as they are not abused: and on the other side, how lawfull it is, yea, and how necessary, to take away the vse of them, for preuenting of an inconuenience. So that we may say thus much in the Huguenots behalfe; that they doe not in this point swarue so much from the practice of the ancient Church, seeing they doe not condemne those diuers Ceremonies which were practised anciently; notwithstanding, that they doe now forbear them, especially when they haue obserued them to change into so much superstition, as that our better learned Catholikes doe euen laugh at the poore people, whom they themselues haue abused.

CHAP. 3.

That the doctrine of the Huguenots hath not beene condemned by any lawfull Iudgement, before the Councell of Trent.

Hitherto haue I spoken of the Huguenots Religion, as it is in it selfe, as well in Doctrine, as in Ceremonies, viz. That Ceremonies be things indifferent; And as for their errors in doctrine, that they be not in the foundation of faith. So that they, not being Heretikes, in respect of the wickednesse of their opinions; let vs now traaverse the Inditement, to finde whether they be so by condemnation. Now our Aduersarie to conuict them, produces the Decrees of di-

uers

vers Councils: to which, before I make answer, I will propose these 4. Considerations.

The first is this: Whether a generall and lawfull Councell, may erre or not in the substance of faith; seeing that it is made vp of men, in whose testimony (as saith Saint *Augustine*) there is so little certainty, his words be these: *A man may beleue the Scriptures, without doubting; but for any other testimonies, it is lawfull either so beleue them, or not so beleue them.* So as this priuledge, to be of an irrefageable certaintie, is onely giuen to the Scriptures: which if it be true, then all the passages which are drawne from the authority of Councils, are thus farre forth onely of weight, as they can be made good by the Scriptures. Neuerthelesse, this being the common answer of the Huguenots: I will make no further vse of it; but like a true Catholike, confesse this to be an infallible Maxime; That a lawfull and generall Councell, cannot erre in the substance of faith.

1. *Consid.**Aug. Epist. 111.*

The second is: Whether if such a generall Councell may erre, though not in the substance of faith; yet at least in other points of Diuinity of lesse consequence: And if they may erre in these, then, seeing (as I haue shewne) that the Huguenots errors be not in the substance of faith, that it followes herevpon, That the Councils may erre in their definitiue decisions of those Controuersies which are betwixt the Huguenots and vs, being onely points of lesser consequence. Whereupon it followes, That this second sort of heresie becomes supernumerary, and their errors not being heresies in their owne nature, cannot be made heresies by bare condemnation. For the reason why hee is counted an Heretike, who resists the Decrees of a Councell, is; for that in doing so, he resists the Iudgement of the Holy Ghost, which doth still, and infallibly, accompany the Councell. But now, if the Holy Ghost be no further forth promised to assist the Councell, then when it treateth of things necessary to saluation; Then they, who hold some Tenets contrary to the Councell in other things, doe not herein resist the iudgement of the Holy Ghost, and by consequence are no Heretikes. Stapleton, professor of the

2. *Consid.*

Stapleton Princip. Doctrin. cont. 4. lib. 6. cap. 15.

*Andradus De-
fen. fid. Trident.
lib. 4.*

*Concil. Trid.
Sess. 3.*

3. Conf.

4. Conf.

Controuersies at *Doway*, and one of the most learned *Catholikes* of our times, who hath written most accurately of this Argument, holds: That the holy Ghost is onely promised to assist the Councils in necessary things, and that in other things they may erre. And *Andradus* himselfe, who defends the Council of *Trent*, in the very same Booke wherein he does defend it as generall, lawfull, and sound in the matter of Faith, condemnes the vulgar Translation of the Bible, as corrupted, although the said Council had authorized it for authenticall; so little did hee trust to the iudgement of Councils, in things which were beside the essence of Faith. But admitting thus much; That a lawfull Council cannot erre at all; yet is there still a third difficulty; *viz.* Whether these Councils which hee produceth against the *Huguenots* be lawfull: which euen a *Catholike* may safely deny; for as much as there be diuers nullities to be found in them, and namely in their manner of proceeding, which are no where found in the ancient Councils, as I will shew in the next Chapter, when I treat of the Council of *Trent*. Now, the *Huguenots* will be very well content to bee tryed by the Ancient Councils, held in the first 600. yeeres of Christ; namely, vntill such time as the Pope (as they say) hauing gotten so absolute a Monarchy in the Church, tooke away the liberty of Councils, and subiected the suffrages of the other Bishops to giue with him: now all the Councils alleaged by our Adversarie, are since that time.

There remaines a fourth difficulty, namely, Whether the *Huguenots* haue beene iustly condemned by the latter Councils. Now vpon these foure considerations, a man may perceiue how frivoulous his brags are of the Councils; forasmuch as he is able to conclude nothing, vnlesse he hath leaue granted him before hand to adde what authority to the Councils he pleaseth; to make what Councils lawfull hee listeth, and to force the Councils to speake what hee would haue them: The most innocent man in the World might bee conuicted by such proofes, if a man would beleeeue without further examination, whatsoeuer euery witnesse shall bring against him; and

and when his Adversary also shall haue leaue, both to packe the witnesses at his owne pleasure, and also to iudge of their testimonies.

But to returne to our purpose. Let vs see next, whether the *Huguenots* stand lawfully condemned by those Councils which hee produceth, or not. The *Catholike* Apology denies it; whereby (in my conceit) hee shewes a great deale of zeale to the *Romane* Religion. For, considering what a world of people are infected with the *Huguenots* doctrine, by reason that it is not yet condemned by any lawfull forme of proceeding; he endeouours to perswade with the *Catholikes*, to cause a lawfull Councell to be called to confute them, to the end, that the *Huguenots* might bee satisfied by being shewed their errors, and bee left without excuse for reiecting the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*. But obseruing that there bee many seditious *Catholikes* (who rather thirst to kill their bodies, then to saue their soules) doe hinder so holy a designe, vnder colour, that they be already condemned by other Councils: The *Catholike* Apology doth very well hercin, to aduise them not to desist for all this, but to pursue so good an enterprife; for as much as the former Decrees, by which the *Huguenots* stand condemned, are not of such authority, but that they may appeale from them to an higher power. So that we must sue out another Procetise against them, to get such a Iudgemēt as they themselues shall neuer be able to except against. Now our Adversary answers, that there is no neede to take this course, affirming, that they bee indeed cast already by such a Iudgement; which he proues by two reasons. One is, that the Doctrine of the *Romane* Church hath beene publicly confirmed by generall Councils, before that of *Trent*. The second is, that the *Huguenots* Religion is the same with that of ancient Heretikes, which hath beene heretofore condemned.

For the first, The chiefe Controuersie is (saith hee) about the Sacrament of the Lords Supper; which is not onely determined by the Councell of *Trent*, but also by ten most ancient Councils of the Church To make good which assertion,

Transubstantiation.

he cites the Councell of *Verceilles, Tours, Vienna, Constance, Florence*: and of five others, celebrated at *Rome*; the chiefe of which, was that of *Lateran*, vnder *Innocent* the third. And these be the tenne Councells which our Aduersary styles the most ancient Councells of the Church. Certainly, then was the Church a long time without Councells, for the ancientest of these was 1000 yeeres after the Apostles times. But peradventure he meanes it onely of the Church of *Rome*, as it is different in doctrine from the ancient Church; which is as much to say, As these Councells are the most ancient of this (*Romane*) Church, which not long before the celebrating of these Councells, became a new Church, and quite contrary to the former. And in this sense, hee doth not account these Councells as simply ancient, but the most ancient onely of that Church, which is not ancient. I can but wonder how he comes so ill aduised, as to giue this aduantage to the *Huguenots*, as to conclude vpon him out of his owne premises; That our holy mother Church of *Rome*, is a new Church: and so giues a hint to the vulgar to discover by his owne confession, that it is so indeed. Which inconuenience, the Author of the Catholike Apology was better aware off to preuent it, for knowing very well, that we are not able to make good the doctrine of the *Romane* Church by the ancient Councells, he aduiseeth rather that wee should labour the calling of a new one; lest that by vrging the other, which indeed be not ancient, the common people might come by this meanes to suspect that our doctrine is new.

But to returne to the said Councells: besides this, that they are all new, there be also seuen of the renne which were neuer receiued for generall, by the most learned defenders of the *Romane* Religion; and by the opinion therefore of those very Catholikes, they may erre, and by consequence it will be lawfull to appeale from them to a generall Councell. Iust as the opinion of *S. Cyprian* about *Rebaptization*, being condemned at *Rome* in a particular Councell, by Pope *Cornelius*, and the sentence ratified by Pope *Stephan*; yet did *S. Cyprian* neuerthelesse continue in his former opinion, accusing both
the

the Popes and the Councils of error; which certainly hee would not haue done, had hee esteemed the authority of a particular councill, without appeale: whereby it appeares, that of those ten Countels which hee vrgeth, there be but three, namely, that of *Lateran*, of *Vienna*, and of *Florence*, which be esteemed generall, euen by the Catholikes themselves: and so by consequence onely three, which haue power definitiue to determine, and not to be subiect to an appeale to be made from them.

As for the Decree of that Council of *Lateran*, wee ought not to thinke it strange, that the *Huguenots* except against it, seeing that the said Council, in the iudgement euen of the *Catholikes* themselves, might erre, in the sentence given against them; for *Scotus* saith of *Transubstantiation*, That it is but an opinion probable; now, an opinion probable, is not necessary; and in determining vpon a Doctrine which is not necessary, *Stapleton* saith: That a generall Council may erre: whereby it appeares, that in the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, the Decree of the Council aforesaid, was not certain. Can wee imagine then that the *Huguenots* will stand to such a Decree, which the *Catholikes* themselves confesse to be subiect to error.

Council of *Lateran*.

As for the Council of *Vienna*, this error (saith hee) is condemned in it, which is: That wee ought not to doe any honour or reuerence to the holy *Eucharist*; which, as euery man knowes is the error of *Caluin*, and of all the *Sacramentaries*. I answer: That our Aduersary, and such as hee, doe much iniure the Church of *Rome*, in giuing the *Huguenots* occasion to reproach the *Catholikes*, as to twit them, that they be lyers and slanderers. For they of the Religion doe not affirme (as hee would make them) that we ought not to giue any honour or reuerence to the *Eucharist*: but that wee should not adore it as the *Catholikes* doe.

Council of *Vienna*.

The last Council is that of *Florence*; the authority whereof, the *Huguenots* may well except against, for that it dissents from other Councils. For the Councils of *Basil* and *Constance*, both which our Aduersary ranks here amongst the ge-

Council of *Florence*.

nerall Councils, haue adiudged it, *That the authoritie of a Councell is aboue the Pope*: whereas the Councell of *Florence*, makes the Pope aboue the Councell. Which sentence is not onely (as I thinke) contrary to the Councell of *Basil* and *Constance*, but contradictory also to the iudgement of all the Diuines in *Paris* at that time. So that if the *Huguenots* doe ill in dissenting from the Councell of *Florence*, they doe it by the example of Catholike Diuines and of other Councils, yea of those which are Generall, by the iudgment even of our Aduersary himselfe.

Freewill.

The second doctrine which he instances in, is that of *Freewill*; for denying of which, the Manichees and other Heretikes stand condemned by *S. Augustine*, *S. Hierome*, *S. Leo*. &c. Now I answer: That the *Huguenots* deny it not in the same manner that those Heretikes did, as is to be well seene in the doctrine of the Manichees: who made two necessary Principles; the one of Good, and the other of Euill; and as absolutely denied *Freewill*, as well of doing ill, as of doing good. But when he can shew, that the *Huguenots* hold any such opinion, his examples will serue to some purpose.

Further, he confirms the said opinion by foure other Councils, *viz.*: by a particular one held in France, and by those of *Anraanches*, *Sens*, and *Constance*. I answer; that it were but an easie matter so to interpret the said Councils, as that the *Huguenots* need not refuse them in this point of *Freewill*. But for breuities sake, I will not stand to examine them, because that three of them be particular, and for that respect may erre (as I haue shewn before) and may be appealed frō: and for the fourth, which is that of *Constance*, though it be called generall by our Aduersarie, yet *Bellarmino* neuertheless receiues but 18 Councils for generall and lawfull, of which ranke this of *Constance* is none.

Children dying without Baptisme.

The third herisie that he speakes of is, That the *Huguenots* hold, that little Children dying without *Baptisme*, doe not perish: which that they doe, is plaine enough (saith hee) And how? namely, by so many testimonies of Scripture, by so many Decrees of auncient Councils, by so many resolu-
lutions

lutions of holy Fathers: And yet does hee alleadge but two passages onely out of *S. Austen*, who indeed as he was of this opinion, That Children could not be saved without Baptisme; so held he likewise, That they could not be saved without the *Eucharist*. Which opinion of his, even our *Catholikes* themselves doe condemne. Why then should the *Huguenots* be Heretikes rather for dissenting from Saint *Augustine* in one Sacrament, then the *Catholikes* are for disallowing his iudgement in the other?

The fourth point, is, the *Worshipping of Images*: which was confirmed by the second Council of *Nice*, vnto which I may well oppose the Councell of *Frankford*, celebrated since that of *Nice*, which both contemned and condemned the authority of that Councell, and the Decrees of it. Neither does it make any thing for our Aduersary, to say, that these testimonies are of weight enough amongst *Catholikes*, for there were none in the Councell of *Frankford* but *Catholikes*, and the Popes Legates themselves; which assisted at it. Obserue then all the Councils which our Aduersary hath rakte together against the *Huguenots*: All of which, excepting those three of *Lateran*, *Vienna*, *Florence*, and this last of *Nice*, are particular, and so by consequence, their Decrees may be annulled and reuerfed. Further of these foure, which by some are accounted generall; the first (that of *Lateran* I meane) was by the sentence of *Scotus* and *Stapleton* (two grand *Catholikes*) subiect vnto error. The words he vrgeth out of the second, (viz. that of *Vienna*) are nothing to the purpose. The iudgement of the third (which is that of *Florence*) is contrary to the Decrees of the Councils of *Basile* and *Constance*. The last of *Nice* was condemned by that of *Frankford*: wherefore then should the *Huguenots* giue way to the authority of such Councils, from whom the *Catholikes* themselves, yea Councils also of *Catholikes* themselves, doe disagree, how can wee hope then to conuert them by such proofes? let vs call a new one then; let vs giue indifferent audience to their Ministers. let vs refuse their Arguments to their very faces, else shall wee neuer recall the *Huguenots*, that are gone.

Worshipping
of Images.

2
That the Doctrine of the Huguenots is not the same with that of the ancient Heretikes already condemned.

Retraict. lib. 2.
cap. 17.

Prayer for the dead.

gone astray, into the right way.

The second reason, whereby our Adversarie confutes the Huguenots, is ; Because they agree in doctrine with the ancient Heretikes, viz. the Arrians, who (as Saint Augustine testifies) reiected, 1. Prayers for the dead: 2. The set times of Fasting: 3. The difference betwixt the Bishop and the ordinary Priest: And 4. with Iovinian and Vigilantius, in the point of Continency and Virginity. 5. Merits and rewards of Saints: 6. The Adoration of Reliques: 7. The Inuocation of Saints: 8. The Election of Meates. I answer. First, That euen as a good Catholike may erre, so may an Heretik also speake truth. Saint Cyprian and Ticonius the Donatist, hauing diuersly interpreted a place of the holy Scriptures, Saint Augustine reiects Saint Cyprians exposition, and allowes that of Ticonius. So that it is not enough barely to shew that an Heretike hath maintained such and such an opinion, valesse hee proue withall, that the said opinion is hereticall. Secondly, I haueshewed in the former Chapter, that the vse of things indifferent, might be lawfull in the ancient Church, and yet vlawfull in this of ours: so that the Huguenots may iustly blame the selfe-same things which the said Heretikes did vniustly except against, vntill we can proue, not onely the things to be the same; but also make it appeare, that there is not now a greater abuse, in the same things, then there was then. As for the opinions following, the Huguenots will affirme, that neither did the Fathers hold them in the same manner that the Catholikes now doe, nor that the Heretikes tooke the same exceptions to them, that the Huguenots now doe: as wee may perceiue by the exceptions following.

First, as for Prayer for the Dead, the Huguenots will affirme, That the Church in the beginning, celebrated onely a Commemoration of the dead, wherein (as I shewed in the former Chapter, they made mention likewise of the Apostles, and of those that be already gone to Heauen. Now this Commemoration (will the Huguenots say) brought forth Prayer for the dead, this Prayer brought forth Purgatory; Purgatory, Pardons; and Pardons haue brought in pence into the Popes coffers.

coffers. Now will they say further (that so long as these abuses were not in the Church, if any man had found fault with this custome, of Commemoration, he should but have shewed himselfe to be of a quarrellsome spirit, yea, they will further say; that petty abuses, especially such as beare a shew of Charitie, might some what be winked at, as Prayer for the Dead, had: which custome serued then also to stirre vp in the Pagans, a better esteeme of the Christian faith: but this occasion being now ceased, and the abuses remaining so great, as they affirme them to be; tis now no time to winke at them any longer, nor is there any other meanes left vs, to reforme them, then to take away the first occasion whence they proceeded, thogh in themselues they be of no great consequence. So that if we will shew wherein the Huguenots resemble the other ancient Heretiks, in taking exceptions vnto prayer for the dead, we must shew withall, how that the ancient Church vsed the same chaffering for Pardons and Indulgences, for the deliuering of soules out of Purgatorie, that the Church of Rome at this day doth. Otherwise, the abuse being not the same, the things deserue not equall blame, and they that finde fault with them are not alike faulty.

Touching set fasting dayes, I am heartily sorry, that he, in giuing out, that the Huguenots doe herein imitate the ancient Heretikes, giues them advantage to reuenge themselues vpon vs, and to proue the cleane contrary; namely, that it is we that follow the ancient Heretikes: for *Eusebius* sayth, *That it was Euseb. 5. 16.* *Montanus the Heretike*, who first set downe the *Rules for Fasting*, seeing that before that, these set fasting dayes were not ordained with any intention to bind the Consciences, but for orders sake onely. Surely then he was not in the right, who neuer found fault with them, seeing there was at first no superstition in them. But since that (say the Huguenots) the superstition is come to that height, that the very day, only because it is such, or such a Saints Eue, is esteemed much holier then other dayes. So then, this order hauing occasioned superstition, to auoid this superstition, wee may dispose otherwise of that order.

2
Set Fasting
dayes.

3.
Distinction of
Bishops and
Priests.

Comment in cap.
1. Epist. ad
Titum.

4.
Mariage and
Virginity.

5.
Merits of
Saints.

And now as concerning the difference betwene the Bishop and the ordinary Priest; the Huguenots will say, that at first they were both equall: but that since then, some amongst them haue beene promoted to dignitie aboue the rest, and at last One is become Monarch ouer them all. Now (will the Huguenots confesse) that before this vniuersall Monarchy of the Pope, there was not the like reason to blame the distinction of degrees in Pastors, which in it selfe was tolerable, and not altogether vnprofitable: But they will say withall, that it is most manifest, how that the Fathers neuer held this distinction to haue beene instituted by God, but onely to be a positive ordinance of men, to preserue (as Saint *Jerome* saith) the vnitie of the Church. A Priest (saith he) is the same with a Bishop, but it was afterwarde ordained throughout the world, that one should be made choice of aboue the rest, for the auoiding of Schisme. Howbeit he confesseth that Bishops are superior to Priests, by Custome rather, then by diuine Ordination.

The fourth point wherein he saith that the Huguenots doe imitate the ancient Heretikes, is concerning *Mariage and Virginity*, which is but a meere calumny: for the Huguenots affirm not with *Ioninian*, That mariage is simply equal to Virginity; but onely in such a sense as Saint *Augustine* speaks it, who sayes, that he dares not preferre the virginity of Saint *Iohn*, before the mariage of *Abraham*. Nor with *Vigilantius*, that it is vnlawfull to make a Priest, vnlesse he were first married: but with that holy man *Paphnutius*, that it is lawfull for a Priest to be married.

Touching the *Merits and rewards of the Saints*, I cannot tell what he would say: for if he meanes by it, That the Saints receiue a recompence of their good workes, the Huguenots will agree to it: but if he meanes it of *workes of supererogation*, laid vp (as they say) in the treasury of the Church, and applied by the Popes Indulgences, vnto the soules of other men; the Catholikes will say, that the Church liued in the same ignorance for the first thousand yeares, that the Huguenots now doe: for it is not long since that for the benefit and advance-

ment

ment of the Pope, God first revealed this treasure, which had been hid so long, and the most gainfull commodity of Indulgences also.

Now as for *Reliques*, I say that even the same Saint *Hierome* who wrote against *Vigilantium* for taking exception to the Reliques of Saints; doth yet in the same booke against *Vigilantium*, allow of the Eues of Saints: howbeit for certaine abuses committed in the night of the said Eues, which they called the *Vigils*, the Catholikes themselves haue forbidden them: And now fast onely vpon the Eues, although the dayes doe still retain the names of Eues. So then we must either grant that the Catholikes are condemned by Saint *Hierome*, as well as the Huguenots; or else that the abuse of things, causeth them to be thought blame worthy at one time, and not at another. So that we must not consider whether the Huguenots agree with *Vigilantium*, in the taking exception to Reliques; but whether there bee not now more abuse in the worshipping of them, then in Saint *Hieromes* time. For the Huguenots do not now simply except against Reliques, insomuch that I haue heard diuers Huguenots say, That if they could bee certaine that they had any ancient monument of our Saviuor, or of his Apostles, they would make very precious esteeme of them: and farre more, then of any antique medall or other antiquity of the old Romanes. By greater reason then doe they honour their persons, although they do not invoke them being dead, for that (say they) themselves forbad it whilst they lived. So that if we will proue the Huguenots to be enemies to the honour of the Apostles, we must proue out of their writings, That such was their will to be invocated. Else wil the Huguenotes tell vs, That they haue the Saints in more honour then the Catholikes, in that they haue such a care to obserue their precepts now after their deaths: It being eident, That that child who is most carefull to performe his last will and testament, loues his deceased father best, then if hee should onely keepe his picture by him.

The eight and last opinion of the ancient Heretikes, is, the election of meats. Whereunto the Huguenots will giue the
8
Election of
mean,

same answer as to the former objections: viz. that it was vnlawful in those times to find fault with the election of meats, and yet lawfull to condemne it now. The reason is, for that it was then an order onely, without enforcing of the conscience to obseue it.

*Durand l. 6 de
disiunctionis.*

And if any man reply, That they now in the Church doe but the same, and that it is onely the meaner sort of people that account one meat holier then another: and that the better learned Catholikes hold, that the sin of eating flesh vpon dayes whereon it is forbidden, is onely in regard of the ordinance, and not in regard of the nature of the meats: Whence comes it then that *Durandus* that great defender of the ceremonies of our Church, makes vse of this reason, to confirme abstinence from eating of flesh; namely, That fish is a more holy meat: for that in the time of *Noahs* flood, God cursed the earth, and the creatures that it brought forth, but not the waters.

Simile,

See here now the ancient heresies reuiued (as he saith) by the Huguenots: but he is in the wrong: for that they ought not to be ranked amongst the Heretikes, vntill such time as we haue made prooffe, how that the Church of Rome doth not onely agree with the Primitiue in the same things, but also in the very circumstances of the things: for those things which are of themselves ceremonies, are also of themselves indifferent; and it is the right vse or abuse of them, which makes them lawfull or vnlawfull. So that by consequence it may be at this time lawfull, and at another time vnlawfull, to take exceptions to them; Euen as it was not lawfull to breake the brazen Serpent, whilst it was a Sacrament, but necessary to breake it, when it became an Idoll.

CAP. 4.

That the Councell of Trent is not lawfull.



EE are come at last, thanks bee to God, to the holy Councell of *Trent*; a Councell whereof our Aduersary had need to make good account, for that the proofes drawne from the former Councells, concerned onely two or three questions; and those also, rather probable coniectures, then proofes. But as for the Councell of *Trent*, that openly confutes all the heresies now maintained by the Huguenots; by reason whereof, our Aduersarie toyles himselfe more in the defence of that, then in any other question whatsoever: albeit hee vses not any proofes to confirme it, but answers onely to the objections of the *Catholike Apologie*, which I find to bee three in number.

The first is, That the Pope did therein take vpon him the office both of Iudge and Partie: and that himselfe conuoked the Councell, and sat President in it.

The second is, That those who sought the reformation, could not bee heard in it.

The third: that for as much as the Huguenots are able to alledge diuers nullities, both in the forme, and also in the definitions of the said Councell; we are not bound to accept of the ordinances thereof without examination of them: For as much as S. *Iohn* hath commanded vs to try the *Spirites*.

To the first Obiection: That the Pope was both Iudge and Party, he answers. That the Pope ought not to lose his right of calling Councells, and of being President in them, for that hee had obtained this right 1500. yeares before. The Huguenots can easily cut him off 500. yeares of his time. In all which space, the Pope neither once called any general Councell, nor sat President in it. The first of *Nice* was called by *Constantine* the great. That of *Constantinople* by *Theodosius* Senior: That of *Ephesus*, by *Theodosius* Iunior: That of *Chalcedon*, by

Martianus, the Emperour. The same also may bee affirmed of those that sit President in them. In the Councell of *Nice* was *Hosius* Bishoppe of *Corduba* in *Spain*, President. In the Councell of *Ephesus*, *Cyrl*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*. And thus much may suffice for so evident a truth.

* *In dernier resort.*

Secondly, he answers, That it is nothing repugnant to the equity of a great Prince, to bee both Iudge and Party. In so much as a Soueraigne Prince is perpetually Iudge, vntill hee bee lawfully declared to haue forfeited his principality, although the suite bee commenced against himselfe. But I say, that there is still a third, which arbitrates betwixt the Prince and his Subiects, when there is a suit betweene them: And although the Iudge be the Princes Officer, yet may he pronounce sentence against him,* which himselfe cannot repeal: and there is no Prince, but a Tyrant, that would reverse that iudgment, as the Pope hath done in disanulling the decrees of the Councils of *Basil* & *Constance*, made against himselfe. But admit I should confesse, that a Prince might be Iudge in his owne cause, yet ought that to bee vnderstood in a suite of meane consequence: but when the controversie be, whether he be a lawfull King or not, we may well assure our selues that he would never be deposed, if hee might be his owne arbitrator: and of this nature is the first Article of the procelle against the Pope. The Huguenots deny him to be head of the church. How then I pray shall this Controversie bee decided, if there be no other Iudge besides himselfe?

Thirdly, hee shewes by examples, that Pope *Marcelline*, *Sixtus* the third, *Symachus*, *Leo*, *Alexander*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, *Cyrl*, and *Leo* the first, were Iudges in their owne causes. As for *S. Marcelline* (saith he) when as hee had offered Incense vnto Idols, hee went and accused himselfe in the Councell of *Sinuessa*, and yet durst no man denounce Sentence against him, but all the Bishops cryed out with one consent: *Father, iudge thy self with thine owne mouth*. To which I answer: That it is easie to discover this to be but a forged Councell, which brings in the Emperour *Dioclesian*, talking with *S.*

Marcelline

Marcelline at Rome, and enticing him to Idolatry; whereas *Sigarius de ca-*
Dioclesian was at the same time at *Nicomedia*, a City of *Bithi-*
nia. Secondly, there is a great deale of difference betweene a
 plaine case, & a right in question. For *S. Marcelline* was accu-
 sed of an act, of which he was most apparantly guilty: So that
 the Bishops perceiuing that the Pope denied not the fact, and
 that he was penitent for it, offered to refertse themselves to
 that sentence which hee would giue against himselfe. Iust as
 if a man should say to a Theefe that were taken in the man-
 ner; Thou seest thy selfe openly guiltie, thou knowest like-
 wise the punishment ordained by the law for such offenders,
 What thinkest thou that thou hast deserved? Speake a Gods
 name, and bee thine owne Iudge: Surely this would be very
 acceptible to all malefactors, to conclude thereupon, that
 they should haue no other Iudges goe vpon them but them-
 selues. His second example is of *Sixtus* the third, who being
 (saith he) accused of adultery, would haue a Synode called
 by th' Emperours authoritie. But they would not, nor indeed
 durst they (saith hee) meddle with his Cause before all the
 Bishops were met, and that they vnderstood the Popes
 pleasure, whether hee were willing to haue them so de-
 cide his businesse, or not. I answer; that this was but a singu-
 lar fauour shewne him by the Emperour *Valentinian*, by
 reason of his innocency: For the Pope himselfe was willing
 that other men should haue beene Iudges in his businesse:
 But it followes not herevpon, that euery Pope in euery
 cause ought to claime the same priuiledge; but the con-
 trary rather: *viz.* That Pope *Sixtus* the fift, who would not
 suffer himselfe to bee Iudged by any other man, ought to
 haue beene so, because *Sixtus* the third, who would haue
 beene so, was not. What necessitie is there in censuring him,
 whose innocencie is cleare; and as it was a token of in-
 nocency in the one to submit himselfe vnto censure, so to re-
 fuse all mens verdicts, but his owne, is an euidence, that hee
 finds himselfe guiltie. But I demand now, whether that singu-
 lar priuiledge granted vnto *Sixtus*, must thenceforth be taken
 for a leading cause or not: If he answers no, then is this in face
 nothing

nothing to his purpose: if yea, The Catholikes will oppose it; *Tam. 1. Cont. 4.* for *Bellarmino* confelleth, that in case of heynous crymes, a Councell may be called to sit vpon the Pope: But he thinks not peradventure that *Sixtus* was accused of any heinous crime: which (as I thinke) is the reason that hee names not his fault, because he barely intimates, that he was accused of Adultery; whereas indeede, he was accused for defiling of a Nunne; which wee good Catholikes, style not Adultery, but Incest; by reason of the spirituall consanguinity which is betwixt a Priest and a Nunne.

His third example of *Symachus*, whose consent (sayth he) was required euen for the calling of that Councell, wherein himselfe was accused. The Huguenots will desire no more at the Popes hands, then to doe as *Symachus* did; for, albeit his consent went to the calling of the Councell; yet when it was called, hee tooke not vpon him the part of a Iudge in it, but with all humblenesse purged himselfe before the Council of those crimes which hee was charged withall.

The fourth example is of *Leo* the third, of which passage the troath is this: The Romans bearing a spleene to *Leo*, for that *Charlemaigne* the Emperour had inforced them to sweare alleageance to him; out of meere malice laid many slanders vpon him; But *Charlemaigne* appearing at Rome, they, for feare of him, durst norstand to it to prosecute their proofes against him, but at the very first canuasse they all cryed out, *That the Apostolike See could not bee iudged by any man.* Which clamour testifies nothing else, then, *That is the nature of the vulgar, to fall from one extreame to another.* And therefore they hauing slandered the Pope before out of malice, they afterwards thought to curry fauour againe, by flattering him for feare. But let vs heare what followes: Did not *Arrins* (saith hee) heretofore dispute the case in a matter of faith with *Alexander*? Notwithstanding was this *Alexander* iudge in the Councell of *Nice*. Was not *Cyrill* President in the Councell of *Ephesus*, notwithstanding hee was one of the parties? And who but *Leo* sat President at the Councell of *Chalcedon*, notwithstanding that al the difference then was betwixt him and

and *Dissonus*? I answer: That the controuersies which then were betwixt *Alexander*, *Cyri*, *Leo*, and the foresaid Heretikes, concerned them no more then it did the rest of the Bishops of the Church: whereas that of the Pope is a private quarrell, wherein the dignity of his person is questioned. Againe, *Cyri* was not President of the Councell, so as that he could allow or annul the Decrees as hee thought good; but saw only first in order, hauing otherwise but his single voice; whereas the Pope now adayes hath his negatiue voice to disannul a whole Councell though generall: yea, and to make his Decretals vpon what he list, without a Councell. As for *Alexander*, he saw neither as Iudge nor President, but onely as a private Bishop amongst the rest. To conclude, *Leo* came not at all to the Councell of *Chalcedon*, and *Anatolius*, Patriarch of *Constantinople* saw President in it.

His concluding reason why the Pope may be Iudge, is, because (as he sayth) he is not Iudge alone, but hath diuers Assistants. I answer: That in the latter Councells hee hath bene sole Iudge, and that the rest of the Bishops haue not bene so much his Assistants, as his Vassals. For, whatsoever the Councell decrees, is void, without the confirmation of the Pope be to it, (witness his abrogation of the Councells of *Franckford*, *Basil*, and *Constance*.) Contrariwise, whensoever the Pope makes a Decree without a Councell, it is of as much vertue as the definitions of the most holy Councell that euer was or can be. For the Popes Aduocates maintaine, that he cannot erre in a matter of faith, though hee should give iudgement without a Councell: and that a Councell may erre, if not confirmed by him. To what purpose then serue the other Bishops ioyned with him as companions, when as he may doe all without them and they nothing without him?

The second Obiection of the Catholike Apology, viz. That the *Huguenots* had not faire audience: is first (saith he) confuted by that very booke which the Protestants set forth, intituled, *Causae Eluctores*: for they confesse in that Book that they were summoned to the Councell. And wee may reade moreover of many ample safe conducts, whereby full

2 Obiect.

liberty was given to the Protestants, to come to the Council. And this briefly is his answer: to which I replies

First, that the booke which he mentions, delivers no reason why they came not to the Council, but why they iudged that the forme of proceeding in that Councell was like to be such, as that their comming thither would have beene to no purpose. But to what end answers hee, that they were summoned? The Apology affirms not, that they were not called, but that they were not heard. For it is not enough for a Iudge to call both the parties before him, if he suffers but one of them to speake: and iust thus fell it out at that Councell of Trent; for *Brentius*, and other Divines of *Swenia*, were sent thither by the Duke of *Wittenberge*, but might not be suffered to dispute when they came there. *Melancthon* also, and other Ministers of *Saxony*, were vpon the way but turned backe againe, hauing receiued intelligence from *Mauritius*, the Electors Ambassador there, that they could not be heard.

Secondly, I reply; that admit that they had been suffered to dispute, and had been heard, yet were the Conditions altogether vnequal, for they requiring to haue a deciding voice with the rest of the Council, according to the form of the safe conduct granted to the *Bohemians* by the Councell of *Basil*. But the *Tridentine* Fathers would none of that; refusing to admit of any to haue decisive voices, but only the Catholike Divines.

Thirdly, the *Huguenots* had good cause to suspect the safe conduct; for *Iohn Hu* had also a safe conduct from the Emperour *Sigismund*, to come to the Councell of *Constance*; and yet comming thither was there burnt.

Obiect. 3.

To the third Obiection, viz. That the Apostle commands us to try the spirits whether they be of God, or no: hee answers; That the Apostle there speaks not of such things as be already certaine, and defined in the Church: but of matters rather vpstart & ambiguous as are those of our trecherous Adversaries. Soft & faire, not too fast; there is no man affirms, that we must try a thing that is certaine; but that we are not to settle our beleeve vpon it, without proofs that it is certain. For a thing may be certaine in it selfe; neuerthelesse, if it does not appear

to

to be certaine vnto vs, we may well make triall of it, for that without trying, we cannot vnlerstand the certainty. But it is (saith he) lawfull to try the *Huguenots* opinions, because they be new and ambiguous. If then it be lawfull to try the new, tis also lawfull (say I) to try the old; for two opposite Opinions are *Relatiues*; so that we cannot make demonstration that the new are false, but we must proue withall, that the old are true. And as for the ambiguity of the *Huguenots* doctrine, if it be ambiguous, then is it not certainly false; and if their doctrine be not certainly false, then is not the *Catholikes* certainly true: and consequently, euen by the iudgement of our Aduersary himselfe, it is lawfull to try it. But let vs now examine his reasons vpon which he concludes, that it is not lawfull to try the Spirits of the Councell.

First (saith he) if we ought to try them all, then were it lawfull to try the Spirits of the Councell of *Nice*, *Constantinople*, *Ephesus*, & *Chalcedon*: Whereupon it must follow, that we ought to discusse againe the wicked heresies of *Arrius*, *Macedonius*, *Nestorius*, and *Eutiches*, and examine againe the sacred Scriptures themselves, the Oracles of the Prophets, the History of *Moses*, and finally the holy Gospell. At length he concludes, That if things which be determined by the holy Councils, ought to be held for certaine, there is no reason to suffer the Decrees of the Council of *Trent* to be called againe into question. I answer; That we ought to hold the Decrees of the former Councils for most certaine; and yet is it lawfull neuerthelesse, to make question of the determinations of the Councell of *Trent*: to which purpose diuers reasons might be alledged; howbeit, this one may suffice for the present: For that in euery Councell, we ought to deliberate and measure things, before we iudge; and after this, the iudgement of a Councell which hath duly examined and iudged, (according to the right measure) ought not to be called againe in question. But to know now, whether a man hath truly measured, we must take consideration of the size and manner of measuring by it. Now will the *Huguenots* say, that the Rule which the Councell of *Nice* did measure by, was onely the

Tbid. l. 10. c. 70.

Scripture; or the written Word, as the words of *Constantine* doe testifie: which be these; *All seditious contentions set a side, let us discusse the things in controuersie by the testimonie of the Scriptures diminely inspired.* The manner of measuring then was, to apply the Doctrine to the said Rule or Scripture, and accordingly to receiue or reiect it, as it was conformable or varying, to or from the said Rule. But now hath the Councell of *Trent* (will the *Huguenots* say) much failed in all these circumstances.

For first, it decided before it measured, for as much as euen before their comming to the Councell, they were euery man of them, resolued to condemne the *Huguenots*. Secondly, in examining and measuring of the questions, it measured not by the written Word onely, but by *Traditions* also, as it was agreed vpon at the fourth Session of the said Councell. So that it measured sometimes, either without a Rule, or at least by a Rule very contrary to that of the Councell of *Nice*. Thirdly, admit that it had measured by a true Rule; yet did it not so much apply the doctrine to the Rule, as bend the Rule, to make it fit to the doctrine, viz. peruerterd the Scripture by an interpretation forced to their owne opinion: For in the fourth Session, it was decreed, *That no man should giue any other interpretation, then that which was consonant to the Doctrine of the Church of Rome.* So that in stead of measuring their doctrine by the Rule, they measured the Rule by their doctrine,

a. Reason.

But he followes it further against the triall of the Spirits; that if we should try all, then should we call againe into question, the very Bookes of the holy Scripture it selfe. I answer no; and that it followes not, that wee should call in question againe the Bookes approued by ancient Councels, because they reiect some, which are approued by the Councell of *Trent*; seeing that in this particular, the iudgement of that Councell, is suspected euen by *Catholikes* themselues. For *Sixtus Senensis* a great *Catholike*, yea, euen since the Councell of *Trent*, hath reiected for *Apocryphall*, the seuen last Chapters of the Book of *Hester*, which were approued by the Councell of *Trent*; which doubtlesse he would neuer haue done, had
he

he held it vnlawfull to try the Spirit of the said Councell.

Thirdly he argueth, that if matters already determined and defined, may be brought in question againe, what end then would there be of Controuerſies? I answer, that this reason is not sufficient to stay the triall of Councels, because that this is the way to set an end to Controuerſies: for that it is not enough to dispatch Controuerſies, vnleſſe we be ſure that this dispatching, is a well ending of them. And ſo the Arrians might euen as well haue perſwaded vs, to rely vpon their packt Councell of *Ariminum*, to giue an end to Controuerſies. To which our Aduerſary can ſhape no other answer, but that their Councell was not lawfull, and that the Councell of *Trent* was. Well then (ſay I) that though we may not examine the Decrees of a Councell, yet may we try whether the Councell were lawfull or not: and for this once, we deſire no more aduantage then this; and thus much muſt be granted vs in deſpite of the World. For if we ought ſimply to rely vpon the Authority of Councels, which commonly paſſe for lawfull amongſt our Doctores, without any further enquiry; there is no reaſon wherefore the Græcians ſhould rather aſſent to the ſecond Councell of *Nice*, which allowed of Images; then to that of *Conſtantinople*, made vp of 300. of their owne Biſhops, which condemned them.

The fourth Reaſon, for which he takes away the liberty of trying their doctrine, from the people, is quoted out of the 17. Chapter of *Deuteronomy*, where it is commanded, That men ſhould enquire of the Priests and Leuites, and the Iudge appointed for the time in caſes of difficulty. And *Moses* (ſaith our Aduerſary) addeth not, *Try the Spirits of the Priests and Iudges*; But if any grow proud, and will not obey the command of the Priests, that man ſhall die, by the ſentence of the Iudges. Nor is this much different from that which our Lord ſaith in the Goſpell of Saint *Matthew*, *The Scribes and Pharisees ſit in Moſes Chayre, whatſoeuer therefore they ſay vnto you, that obſerue and doe*. As for *Moses* Commandement, it was giuen vnto the *Iewes*; whereupon *Rabbi Salomon Iarchi* concludes, *That wee are to beleeue whatſoeuer the Iewiſh Priests ſay*. Since then

*Rab. Sal. Iarchi
in Deuteronom.*

then that their Priests interpreted the Prophecies, euen of Christ himfelfe, otherwife then we Christians doe. A Iew will fay that Christ is not yet come, becaufe their Priests deny it; and if according to our Aduerfaries faying, we ought not to try the Spirits of their Priests; I demand then, how he will answer the *Iewes*, and I will answer him, as he does them; namely, that in the Text this clause is inserted, *According to Law*, that is to say, we are to obey their Commandements, so farre forth, as they are agreeable to the Law; which how can we know, vnlesse we examine it. So that let our Aduersary take his choyce; either to confesse, that we are not in this place forbidden to try the Spirits of the Priests, or else to acknowledge himfelfe to be a Iew.

5. Reason.

To the place of Saint *Matthew*, becaufe he saith, how that it is not much vnlike: our answer shall likewise be the same. For our Sauour hath not commanded vs to obey the Pharises in all things, simply; but not to take such scandall at their liues, as that we should refuse to obey them, when they speake well. For, should we simply giue credit to what they bid vs, without tryall of it, why should we beleue that Iesus Christ is the Sonne of God, when as the high Priest said that he blasphemed, in calling himfelfe so?

Mat. 17.

His last reason is drawne from the Councell of the Apostles mentioned, *Acts 15. It seemed good vnto the holy Ghost, and to vs*: Whence he concludes, *That Gods Spirit is so infallibly eyed vnto a lawfull Councell, that we ought not to call the definitions of it into question*: nor would Saint *Paul* himfelfe (saith our Aduersary) examine the instructions of the Councell of the Apostles: as Saint *Luke* saith, *Acts 16. He gaue them that to obserue, which was ordained by the Apostles and the Elders which were at Ierusalem*. I would faine aske one of our Catholike Doctors, to what purpose are there so many disputations and consultations at our Councils, if so be that the holy Ghost doth so infallibly direct them? His answer will be, That Gods ordinary prouidence is such, as that he still assists them with his Spirit, when they for their parts, apply that diligence, which they ought, and not otherwise; Iust as he makes not the ground

ground fruitfull, but when the husbandman tills and sowes his corne in it, and applies such labour as the soyle requires. And thus much is cleare by this passage: namely, That the Apostles did apply all industry and the aptest meanes, for the resolving of the doubts proposed: for it is said, That after a long disputation *Peter* stood vp: whence a man may conclude; That the holy Ghost is no otherwise promised to a Councell, then conditionally; viz. when the Councell doth apply all the meanes and industry on their parts, for the finding out of the truth: and that otherwise it may bee destitute of Gods Spirit; namely, when it doth not apply the meanes. So that albeit wee are not to examine the Decrees of that Councell, which hath vted these meanes; yet may wee enquire whether it hath applied these meanes or no; for that we cannot be otherwise assured that Gods Spirit did assist it. The *Huguenots* I know well, will require another manner of tryall; not onely of the course in the proceedings, but of the Articles also concluded vpon. But that the *Huguenots* may not haue a twofold aduanrage against vs, we should doe well to shew them, first, That the Councell of *Trent* hath obserued these lawfull courses; and then shall we haue but one thing to doe; which is, to make good the Articles; which are so difficult to be proued, that it would be wisely done of vs, to put it off as long as we can, and first to decide all other differences.

CAP. 5.

That the Councell of Trent hath not as yet been receiued in France.



Ven as the Kings of France ought to haue no one thing in greater recommendation, then to be the inheritors of the vertues of their predecessors; so should they not likewise bee more carefull of any thing, then to eschew such occasions as might soile the reputation of this vertue, and bewray them to haue cooled in the zeale and piety of their

their Ancestors: who (as all know) haue ever beene accounted the eldest sonnes of the Church, and the maine vpholders of the Sea Apostolique: and for that one reason of this their zeale, haue receiued more priuiledges and honors, then any other Prince of Christendome whatsoeuer. Now then, seeing that the Councell of *Trent* hath established so many decrees, so directly opposing the former priuiledges and honors; what hath it done more by so doing, then to proclaim to the world, That the Kings at this day haue lesse zeale then their Ancestors had, and are therefore vnworthy to enioy those honors bestowed vpon them. So that the reason why our later Kings haue reiected the said Councell, may be, for that they could not well approue of that, without reprouing of themselves; nor publish it, without publishing also vnto the world, a shamefull confession of their owne demerits. But to come to the point; I purpose onely to buckle to the objections of the Catholike Apology, which our Aduersary offers to confute; and those be three.

1 That the Kings of *France* haue ever refused that Councell.

2 That it hath called in question the precedency and priority of place, which was due vnto our Kings in all assemblies.

3 That there be diuers things decreed in the said Councell flatly against the liberties of the French Church, and the Maiesty of the King.

1 *Obiect.*

As for the first point, namely, that it hath neuer beene receiued by our Kings: he answers to it in generall; *That this Obiection touches not so much the Councell, as it reproacheth the Kings of France. For what else can this meane (saith he) then to perswade all men, that our Kings haue beene Schismatikes, and disobedient to the Vniuersall Church.* I answer, that it is no newes to haue the Kings of France oppose themselves against the Councils of the Church of Rome: seeing that not the Councell of *Trent* alone, hath beene refused by King *Henry* the second, and all his Sonnes who reigned after him; but euen the generall Councell of *Vienna* also, was neuer wholly receiued in France. And euen as King *Henry* the second, forbade his Bishops to be present at the Councell of *Trent*, so
would

would not King Charles the seventh suffer his to bee present at that of Basle: and yet was not he any whit the more a Schismaticke (as our Adversary concludes) nor disobedient to the Church vniuersall. But let vs see now, how hee demonstrates the Councell of Trent to haue beene receiued by our Kings: There be certaine Letters (saith he) of Charles the ninth yet so be some, in which he honoureth and reuerenceth that Councell: and in the very same page, to answer that objection of K. Henry the seconds forbidding his Bishops to repaire vnto that Councell, he hauing nothing else to say; then *That it is not so necessary to looke so narrowly into what King Henry did at the beginning; for, that the admitting or receiuing of a Councell, ought not to be taken from the beginning but from the ending of it.* According to which rule I also answer, That the Letters sent by Charles the ninth, before the Councell broke vp, do not proue his approbation of the Councell, because he refused to receiue it, when it was fully ended. For if the reiecting of it by King Henry the second before the end of it, does not proue that hee did finally reiect it; no more doth that honor which Charles the ninth did it, before it broke vp, proue that he did receiue it.

Secondly, *The King* (saith he) *showed the reason why the Bishops of France came no sooner to the Councell;* which is one of the most pleasant Arguments that yet I euer heard. For if this be a sufficient reason to proue that the King did receiue the Councell, because he gaue a reason for the absence of his Bishops; then haue the Protestant Princes of Germany also receiued it, because they publish a whole booke of the reasons that moued them to absent themselves from thence.

Thirdly, *The King* (sayes he) *sent his Orator and Ambassador the Sieur de Lausack, Knight of his owne Order, thither; who in his Maiesties name was at the Councell; with whom he sayd in commission Reginald Ferrier President of the Parliament, and Guy de Pauc, Iudge Major of Tholouse.* A goodly prooffe, The King approoued of the Councell, because hee sent his Ambassador thither. As though the Electors of Germany of the confession of Augsburg, sent not their Ambassadors thither.

ther also? Where then lyes the force of his Argument, is it in this, that *Adenseur de Lausacke* was a Knight of the Order, or in this, That he was accompanied by *Monsieur du Ferrier* and *de Pibrac*: For no other sense can I collect out of his words, nor any other prooofe for the receiuing of the Councell; nor is there indeed any other. For the King sent not his Ambassadors to the Councell to confirme it, but to admonish it, to reforme the abuses of the Church; giuing expresse charge vnto his Ambassadors, that they should sollicite the Fathers, not to decree any thing against the *Huguenots*, vntill they themselues had first of all reformed the abuses in the Ecclesiasticall Polity: And in case that this were not done, then that they should protest against the said councell: all which appears in the Letters which the King himselfe sent vnto *Monsieur du Ferrier*. See here then the brieft of the Kings Commission, and of *Monsieur du Ferrier*, & *de Pibrac*, their Orations in the Councell. They both, and *Monsieur du Ferrier* especially, often in the Kings name requiring the reformation of the abuses of the Church. Which admonitions for that the Councell did reiect, they according to their Kings command, reiected the Councell, and refused to subscribe to it; nor did the King afterwards receiue it, or the Court of Parliament euer publish it; no not after that Saint *Bartholomews* day, when the time seemed most importune to fauour any thing, that might be preiudiciall to the *Huguenots*.

But at least the Bishops haue approoued it: For when the decrees of it were openly read in the last Session, the Bishops were present, and gaue their voyces and suffrages.

4. Reason.

I answer: first, that so farre was the consent of the Bishops from confirming of the Councell, that quite contrary it discouers the vniust proceedings of it. For those Bishops that gaue their voyces to it in the last Session, gaue their sentence deliberative vpon the points which had bene treated vpon in the former Sessions, vnder *Paulus* the third, and *Iulius* the third, before that the said Bishops came to the Councell; a thing contrary to all Ciuill Law, to equitie it selfe, and to the customes of all the Parliaments, high Courts of Iustice, and other

The Massacre
anno Dom. 1572

other Iudiciaries, which out of the persons of many Iudges, are made one body. In all which, those that haue not bene there all the time, are not suffered to deliuer their opinions.

Secondly, it doth not hereupon follow, that the Bishops haue approued of this Councell, because they gaue their consents to the Articles of it: For, there is a great deale of difference betwixt those that agree in opinion with the Decrees of a Councell, and those that vphold an opinion, onely because the Councell hath decreed it. For our Aduersary agrees in opinion with the Deuill, in that it is written how God gaue his Angels charge ouer our Lord Iesus Christ, yet he doth not thinke, beleue it neuer the more for thatt the deuill said it.

Furthermore, at what time as they gaue their consent to the Articles aforesaid, the Councell was not confirmed by the Pope. Now it is our Aduersaries owne Tenet, *That a Councell is void, if not confirmed by the Pope*; And this one reason hee makes to serue his owne turne against the Councell of Basle. *It is (saith hee) a Rule most generally knowne, that Councells are not to be receiued without the Authoritie of the Pope.* Whereupon it followes, That those who gaue their consents to the said Articles, did at the very same time when they gaue their consents, hold the said Councell to be as yet no Councell, so that a man cannot hereby proue, that they did receiue the Councell, because they gaue their voyces to the Articles.

To the second Obiection, which touches vpon the pre-
cedency of the most Christian King, he answers thus in brieve: *2 Obiect.*
That the Councell was so farre from offering to diminish the Kings Authoritie, that to the contrary, the Kings Ambassadors by the unanimous consent of all, were seated immediately next after the Emperours; but the Spanish Ambassador, out of his ranke, in another place: to the end, that if it so fell out, that any man were seitors of his place, yet should it not be preiudiciall vnto him. He should not haue answered, *That the Councell seated the Kings Ambassador next vnto the Emperour,* but onely that the Councell did not put him out of his right place. For in the 22 Session, *Monsieur du Ferrer, and de Pibrac,* being suspicious of the affection of the Councell, went in betimes to take vp their
H 2 places,

places, inasmuch that the *Count de Luna* Ambassador for the King of Spain, made publike protestation before the Fathers, how that his place was taken vp: Whereupon *Monsieur de Pi-brac* required, that the said Protestation of his might not be prejudiciall to his Kings Prerogative, whose Ambassadors had ever had the first place, next to the Emperours, as they had at the Councils of *Constance* and *Lateran*: But for all this, the Councell would not vmpire the businesse. And though they tooke not the place away from the Kings Ambassadors, yet our Adversary confesseth, that they would not pronounce that this place did belong vnto them. For first he saith, *That the Spanish Ambassador was set out of his place.* Secondly, *That if any man were by chance set out of his rank, yet would not the Councell haue it to be prejudiciall vnto him.* Which is nothing else then to declare, That that place, which they permitted the Kings Ambassadors to keepe for the time, for auoiding of contention (and for that they had betimes already taken it vp much against the wills of the Fathers) should not be prejudiciall vnto that right, which they thought to be due vnto the King of Spaine.

Secondly, put case the Councell to haue beene so euently affected (as he would make it) yet did they wrong (say I) neuerthelesse, in forbearing to be vmpires openly in the kings cause: For there is no man, that can deny a thing most apparant, at the first dash, but he must gaine vpon it, by little and little. So that the first degree to it, is to call a thing into question: nor does any man wilfully call a thing into question, vnlesse he purposes absolutely to deny it afterwards. So that it is easily discerned, that the Councell at this time bringing the Kings precedency into question, and making the King of Spaine equall with him, had a plot in it, at the next Councell to giue him the place aboue the King of France.

Lastly, admit the Councell to haue had no such plot vpon him, but only to carry an even regard to both, yet the wrong remains neuerthelesse, it being no lesse iniurious to make an inferior equall to his superior, then to make an equall superior to his equall.

There

There remains now (saith our Aduersary) the last Obiection *only, viz. That the Councell of Trent hath decreed diuers things* *against the Realme of France; which is the reason that it is not* *receiued there. But this Obiection (saith hee) serues little to the* *purpose: For the question is not onely about Ecclesiasticall Iurisdic-* *tion, but about Faith and Religion. Wherefore although that* *the Decrees of the Councell for Reformation bee not receiued in* *France, yet the Decrees which treat about Faith, are.*

Our Aduersary cannot deny, but that the Councell of *Trent* hath decreed some things against the French liberty; onely he answers, that all this hinders not the receiuing of the other Articles which meereley concerne Faith. His owne words are, *This obiection serues to little purpose, for that the question is not* *only about Ecclesiasticall Iurisdiction, but about Faith, and* *Religion. And I say againe, that this answer of his, serues as* *little to the purpose; for that we treat not of things that con-* *cerne either Reformation, or Faith, but of the authority onely* *by which those Decrees were enacted. That is to say, whether* *the Iudgement of the Councell of Trent, be in France receiued* *for a sentence not lyable to be appealed from? and whether* *they here beleeuethose Articles wherein they agree with the* *Councell impliciteley, for that the Councell hath decreed them.*

For how shall it be proued, that a man who beleeueth a thing which another hath reported, did beleue it vpon the reporters credit, vnlesse hee be confident withall, that he who reported this would not report an vntruth, and that hee durst trust him in any thing. But France now doth not beleue the Councell of *Trent* in all things: for our Aduersary himselfe confesseth, that it refused the Decrees of the Councell which touched vpon *Reformation*. Whereupon it follows, that though France doth agree in opinion with the councell in what it decreed concerning matters of Faith, yet doth it not holde this opinion for any regard to the councels authority, but for some other respect; else might he conclude as well, That the *Huguenots* do receiue the said Councell, for that they beleue diuers Articles of it, which are against the *Anabaptists*, and other Herenikes of our time. For euen as they refuse the authority of

the said Councell, in that very same part whereof they receive the Articles: so may we as well refuse the whole Councell, and yet receive all the Articles; there being the same respect from the Articles of one part, to the authority of the same part, as from the Articles of the whole, to the authority of the whole. But let vs now marke how hee concludes, that this Councell is received in France. *Our Adversaries owne selfe confesseth (saith hee) That this Councell is received by the Bishops. But what man can perswade himselfe, that the Bishops haue another faith and religion from that professed by the King, and all the Catholike people? For, how may the King be styled, The most Christian, if he were of a faith singular from the Bishops? And how should the people be called, The Lords flocke, unless they acknowledged some Pastors?*

See then, this in briefe is his Argument: The Bishops haue receiued the Councell: The King and the people haue beleueued the Bishops: *Ergo, The Councell hath bene receiued by the King, the Bishops, the Clergie, and likewise of all the people of France.* I haue shewne already how he hath not made it good as yet, that the Bishops which then were haue receiued in and for the Bishops and Clergy at this day, though diuers of them for the aduancement of the holy *League*, haue endeauoured to cause the said Councell to be receiued, yet might the King and the people refuse it notwithstanding, and yet not cease for all that, to be of the same faith with them, in so much as the approbation of that Councell is not an Article of faith: for the Councell of *Ephesus* hath expressly prohibited vs the addition of any other Article of faith vnto those which were then receiued: in which number the receiuing of the *Tridentine* Councell is not. But supposing that they were not of the same Faith, what danger could come of it? *The King (saith he) should not then be most Christian, nor the people Christs flocke.* First, as for the King, for as much as this reason is drawne from his Title, I say, that if the King were the greatest Heretike in the world, yet should hee not be deprived of his Title. *Henry* the eight, King of England, receiued the Title of *Defender of the faith* from Pope *Leo* the tenth, for
writing

writing against *Luther*. King *Edward* the first, and the last *Queene* of famous memory, and the now reigning *KING*, who haue changed the Religion, for defending of which, King *Henry* receiued this Title, doe still keep the same Seyle: And by very good right too; for Titles, though personall, and proper only to the first of the Race that receiue them, (as *Catholike* to *Ferdinando* King of *Arragon*; *Defender of the faith*, to *Henry* the eight King of *England*) yet doe they descend vnto their successors, as ornaments onely annexed to their State. So that it is not *Philip* of *Austria*, who is *Catholike* in that sense, but the King of *Spain*. For, if wee consider of Kings onely in point of Religion, the King of *France* may be as good a *Catholike* as the King of *Spain*; and the King of *Spain* as good a *Christian* as the King of *France*; and yet the Title of *Christian* belongs onely vnto the one, and the Title of *Catholike* to the other.

But about all is this reason ill applied against the King of *France*, for that *Christian* is not a title to distinguish one *Christian* from another, but to distinguish them all from *Pagans*; and in this sense it is given to the King of *France*, as to the first King of *Europe*, that abolished *Paganisme*, and who still had the most warres of all with the *Sarazens*, enemies of the name of *Christ*. True it is, that this title might incline him the more to imbrace that doctrine which is best, but for that it hath not bene hitherto agreed vpon which of the two is the best, wee must not proue one doubt by another. For the *Huguenots* may as well conuert this reason to perswade the King to reforme the Church, as the *Catholikes* vse it, to incline him to maintaine the *Romish* Religion: howbeit there is not any thing that the King can doe, more worthy of this Title of his, then to doe both; that is to say, to maintaine the *Romane* Church, and to reforme it. Neither is there any contradiction in these two, seeing there is no better meanes to make the *Iron* endure long, then to scower away the rust, nor to maintaine the Church of *Rome*, then to reforme the abuses of it. Neuerthelesse, to establish such a course, that any of the *Iron* bee not scraped away, in stead of the rust; and yet

see that it bee bright scowred; there is no safer meanes then to doe quite contrary to that which our Aduersary aduiseeth; viz: To let their Councell of *Treu* sleep, and to call another, wherein both parts may haue indifferent hearing: by which meanes, if so bee that there bee any corruption in the Church of Rome, it may bee seene into and purged. And if there be any error in the doctrine of the Huguenots; they may bee convicted and instructed in a better faith. And this were the way to reunite vs all in one faith; and this would bee an act indeede well worthy a most Christian King.

3 But descend wee now to the people: *How should they* (saith he) *bee the flocks of Christs flocke, if so bee they acknowledge not any Pastor?* I answer; That they may well enough acknowledge their Pastors, though they beleue not iust as the Pastors of their Countrey doe. For that no man is obliged to build his faith, but vpon an infallible foundation: and it is confessed by the Catholikes themselves, that all the Bishops in a whole countrey may erre in point of faith. So that the people are not alwaies obliged, to ground their faith vpon that of their Bishops, and consequently may be of another faith, and yett bee the flocke of *Iesus Christ*: As in very truth, our Sauour does not call them his Sheep which heare the Bishops, but those that heare his voyce; which is, the word of God.

Let vs now looke vpon his conclusion: *And so* (saith hee) *in the Councell honoured of the King, the Bishops, the Clergie, and likewise of all the people of France.* Admire it were so; yett for all this does it not follow, that it is receiued in *France*, vntill he can shew withall, that all the Estates doe receive it: that is, The Church, the Nobility, and the People: But hee makes no mention of the Nobility, but onely of the Church, and the third Estate, so that at the most it is receiued but of two of the three Estates: which may be the cause that our Aduersary, to keep vp the number diuides the Church into two parts, viz. Bishops, and Clergie: *The Councell* (saith hee) *is receiued of the Bishops, the Clergie, and likewise of all the people of France.* Which is a new diuision of the Estates, neuer, as I perswade

perswade my selfe, heard of before. Iudge then what iust occasion the Nobility of *France* now haue to reiect this Councell, when as those who would haue the Councell receiued, doe reiect the Nobility.

That the *Huguenots* may very rightly be accounted members of the Catholike, Apostolike, and *Romane Church*.



His Chapter, at the first blush, seemes to treat of the same Argument that the first doth: for hauing there proued it, That the *Huguenots* are of the same Religion with vs *Catholikes*, it may follow also, that they be of the same Church too: And yet to my thinking, these two Chapters

may very well be parted: not so much in regard of the difference of the nature of the subiect, as of the humors of the persons. For commonly when a *Huguenot* would draw a *Catholike* to his opinion, hee begins euermore with the particular Controuersies: and so vpon the puritie of his doctrine he infers the verity of his Church.

A *Catholike*, on the other side, when hee would winne a *Huguenot*, beginnes still with the Church; and so by the verity of the Church concludes the purity of his Doctrine: and commonly, when eyther of them gets the other out of this tracke, they are to seeke. Which is one of the reasons that they cannot satisfie the aduerser party. For he that would perswade another, must not beginne with that principle which to him seemes best (though indeed it be so) but with that which seemes best in his opinion whom hee desires to perswade, otherwise he shall but lose his labor.

For, when a *Huguenot* shall haue vrged a thousand passages of holy Scripture to proue the truth of his owne particular Assertion, hee shall not be a whit the nearer: and why? For that a *Catholike* will say instantly with himselfe: What though I cannot answer him, yet another may: and if I am to

belceue nothing which I am not able to maintaine by disputation, then should I not belceue the *proceeding of the Holy Ghost: the union of both Natures in Iesus Christ: the Mysteries of the holy Trinity*: all which I haue belceued, without being able to maintaine them, or so much as vnderstand them. And even so, the authoritie of the same Church which makes mee belceue these Mysteries without being able to maintaine them, makes me also to belceue the holy sacrament of the Altar, Purgatory, &c. without being able to maintaine them. So that if a *Huguenot* proceed no further, & doe not shew a reason how a man may be assured of these mysteries without the Churches authority; or else (which I hold more reasonable) why wee ought wholly to relye vpon the authoritie of the Church in one point, and not in another; hee shall neuer say ought to the purpose. Nor can the *Catholikes* haue any happier successe in their perswasives: for when they talke to the *Huguenots* of the Church, how the Church sayes this, and the Church sayes that, and the Church cannot erre: they who are not brought vp to such kinde of phrases; and who found their faith vpon this perswasion, *That the Scripture is cleare on their sides*, What care wee (will they say) what the Church saith, so long as wee agree in opinion with the word of God. So that a *Catholike* shall neuer be able to perswade them to any thing, if hee beginne not at their foundation; and proue, that the Scripture makes not so clearly for them as they imagine it does: and then when they once perceiue, that they cannot confute the *Catholikes* by Scripture, they will be compelled to confesse: That a man can haue no assurance of his faith, without submitting his owne iudgement to the iudgement of the Church: which (as wee say) according to Christs owne promise, is infallibly accompanied with the holy Spirk. For mine owne part, although it bee not my intencion to intice any man, eyther to the one religion or the other, but to qualifie only the passions of men; yet for feare that I should commit the same error in this *Treatise of Pacification*, which they often doe in the course of their perswasives, I thought good to subioyne this Chapter also; to the end that my reasons might

might be drawne from the principles of both Religions. And thus hauing proved in the first Chapter, by examination of the particular questions, according to the *Huguenots* method, that they bee no *Heretikes*, I was also desirous to adde this Chapter, that according to the *Catholikes* manner of proceeding (that is as much to say, as according to the Nature of the Church) I might also proue them (the *Huguenots*) to bee no *Heretikes*. For it were but labor lost, to tell many of our *Catholikes*, that the *Huguenots* holde many of the fundamentall points of faith as well as we, seeing they take not the scantling of an *Heretike* by his opinions, but onely by this marke, *That hee is out of the Church*, vnderstanding thereby no other Church, then that which wee call *Catholike*, *Apostolike*, and *Romane*; excluding all those out of the Church, to whom these three titles may not be giuen, what opinion soeuer they be of. For which reason I resolued to proue, that these three titles doe belong vnto the *Huguenots*.

And first touching the title of *Catholike*: the Church is called *Catholike* in three respects. 1. *In regard of it selfe*. 2. *In regard of the lawes*. 3. *In regard of Heretikes*.

¹
Catholike.

Now the Church is called *Catholike* in regard of it selfe, because in the vniuersalitie thereof it comprehends all times, and all places, viz. the whole number of the Elect, as well those who haue beene since the beginning of the world, and are now departed and triumphant in heauen, enioying euerlasting blisse, as those that are ordained to the like blessednesse whether now aliue, or to be borne hereafter. Which definition is founded vpon the Scriptures: for S. Pauls words are; *The Church of the first-borne which are written in heauen*: and who are written in heauen but the Elect? from whom the reprobates are in this specialty distinguished, *That their names are not written in the booke of the Lambe*. The Church then consists of the Elect who are not restrained to any place or time. For, *Iesus Christ hath redeemed with his blood* (saith Saint John) *Out of euery kinred, and tongue, and people, and nation*. With which definition the Fathers ioyntly consent; *All they* (saith Saint *Augustine*) *which are holy and sanctified,*

²
How the Church is called *Catholike* in respect of it selfe.

Heb. 12. 23.

Reu. 13. 18.

Reu. 5. 9.
August. de Catechizanda rudibus. 2. p. 22.

Greg. Mor. in
Ioh. lib. 28. cap. 9

which are, haue bene, and shall be, are Citizens of the heavenly Ierusalem: And S. Gregory the Pope (that my prooffe may be the more authentick) saith, That all the Elect are embraced in the bosome of the Church, and all the Reprobates are without. And yet was poore Iohn Huffle burnt for an Heretike, for affirming the very same.

O wicked *Catholikes*, that haue made a man to be burnt for an Heretike, for affirming no more, then what a Saint had done, and (which is more) then a Pope had said before him. So then in this signification, neither the Church of *Rome*, nor that which themselves call the *Reformed Church*, can properly be called the *Catholike Church*, but onely parts of it. Nay, we cannot truly affirme, that they be parts of the *Catholike Church*; but that God hath both in the *Romane Church*, and in the *Reformed*, some that be members of the *Catholike Church*. Which is as much to say, as that diuers shall be saued in both Churches. Like as there were many amongst the *Jewes*, at the comming of Iesus Christ; and at this day be in the *Greeke Church*, and in *Prefster Iohns Countrey*, which doe embrace the Christian Faith, without acknowledging the Pope. So that if we appropriate the title of *Catholike* to the *Romane Church*, onely taking it in this signification, it must needs follow, that either all the *Catholikes* are elected (though the *Catholikes* themselves write that diuers Popes haue bene damned) or else, that no lew was ever saued before Christs comming, and that God hath not had his Church at all times: or that no *Greeke* nor *Affrican* can be saued in our time; and then God should not haue his Church in all places. Again, if we attribute not this title of *Catholike* onely to the Church of *Rome*, I can see no reason why the *Reformed Church* should be more excluded then the rest. To be brieve, when we passe our censure vpon any man, whether hee be of the *Catholike Church* or not; we must speake either according to Faith, or according to Charity. If according to Faith, we cannot say, that such or such a man is a *Catholike*, because it is God that knoweth who are his, saith S. Paul: But if wee passe our iudgement according to charity, this will haue vs esteeme all those

to bee of the true Catholike Church, which bee of the visible,
of which I will next speake, and shew how it may be termed
Catholike.

2 The Church, as I have proued already, comprehends
all the Elect, those as well that be already in heaven, as those
that are yet on earth, and remaine mingled among the wic-
ked; which last, though generally more in number, yet the
Elect beare the name of the better part. So that both good
and bad, which make an outward profession of the true faith,
are reputed members of the true Church. According to the
Parable of the net, which held the bad fishes as well as the good.
This Church was separated from the rest of the Gentiles,
with a partition wall (as it were) and before the coming of
Christ pend vp in one country, and restrained to the Family
of Israel: But since Christs coming, *This partition wall is* (as
S. Paul saith) *broken downe; so that neither Jew nor Greeke are*
excluded. And by reason of this difference, that the Iewes in
those dayes had onely this priuiledge, and that now no one
particular country hath it more then another, the Church is
called *Catholike*: that is to say, Spread all the world ouer. And
for that shee is so vniuersall, shee is diuided into particular
Churches: As in Saint Pauls time, into the Church of Ephe-
sus, of Rome, of Galatia, of Corinth, &c. and no one of these
Churches hauing any priuiledge more then another, they
were all together called *The Church Catholike*: not that it is
alwayes euery-where, but for that no country is excluded,
and no place priuiledged. So then, no place being excluded,
there may be other Churches besides that of Rome; and no
place being priuiledged, euen Rome it selfe may be cut off
from the Church.

3 Thirdly, the Church is called *Catholike*, in respect of
the Donatists, who denied the Church to bee dispersed all
ouer the world; but held it to be coopt vp in Affrica: where-
vpon it came to passe, that those Churches which held the
contrary, were called the Catholike Churches. Euen as at
this day, these Churches that hold, the Church to haue need
of reformation, are called *The Reformed Churches*: Which is

2
How the
Church is cal-
led Catholike,
in respect of
the Iewes.

Mat. 13.

Ephes. 2. 14.

3
How the
Church is cal-
led Catholike,
in regard of
Heretikes.

the reason why the more ancient Fathers neuer vsed this terme *Catholike*, to distinguish the pure Churches from the hereticall; but called them *Orthodoxall*. But in proceſſe of time, by reason that the Orthodoxe Churches held, that the Church was Catholike or Vniuerſall; theſe two words *Catholike* and *Orthodoxall*, were taken in one and the ſame ſignification: ſo that at laſt, this title of Catholike, was not onely giuen to the Church, to diſtinguiſh the *Orthodox* from the *Donatiſts*, but alſo from all other Heretikes. For a Catholike in proper ſpeech is not oppoſite to all ſorts of Heretikes, but to the Iewes onely and the Donatiſts. But for as much as cuſtome is the maſter of words (as we ſee in this word *Tyrant*, anciently taken in good part for a King, and now onely for a bad King) this word *Catholike* is taken contrary to his nature, in the ſignification of a pure Church; in ſuch a ſenſe as that a particular Church may be called a Catholike Church, and more or leſſe Catholike, proportionably as it is more or leſſe pure. So that the queſtion betweene the Catholikes and the Huguenots, lies not in this point, *viz.* Which of the Churches is the Church Catholike; but whether of them is moſt Catholike, and which moſt corrupted: for in ſome degree both of them may be Catholike, ſo long as they hold the ſubſtance of faith, (as I ſhewed in the firſt Chapter) and both of them in ſome ſort may be corrupt: it being a thing moſt certaine, That euery viſible Church may haue errors, more or leſſe. *The Church* (ſaith Saint Bernard) *as long as ſhee is in the tabernacle of this body, hath not attained vnto the perfection of beauty, and is not therefore abſolutely faire*: For it is the priuiledge of the Church Triumphant onely to be faire, and as S. Paul ſaith, *without ſpot or wrinkle*. True it is indeed that the Church is ſometime called faire, but this is euer comparatiue-ly: wherefore the Bridegroom in the *Canticles* ſaith of his Spouſe (which is the Church) that ſhee is the faireſt of women: that is, *not ſimply faire* (ſaith S. Bernard) *but the faireſt among women*. And for that ſelfe ſame reaſon, is ſhe in one and the ſame verſe, ſtyled both blacke and faire. *I am blacke* (ſaith the Spouſe) *but I am comely*.

Bern. In Cant.
Serm. 38.

Ephes. 5.

Cant. 1.

I am not ignorant how that the Ancients also did vse this word *Catholike*, for a distinction from an Heretike, in another signification; which in truth was according to the proper interpretation of the word, taking *Catholike* or *Vniuersal*, for a marke of the true Church. For which reason in the ancient Church, when as the whole visible Church yet retained the faith receiued from the Apostles, and that some part of it became corrupted; for the exact discerning vnto whether side we ought to leane, *Vincentius Lyrinensis* gave this Rule: *What else should we doe* (saith he) *but prefer the safety of the body, before a rotten member.* And therefore, for that the body of the Church was at that time sound, all the Church was called *Catholike*, for so much this word *Body*, as well as that word *Catholike*, implies an vniuersality; so that the distinction of *Catholike* and *Heretike*, serues but to distinguish the sound body, from a corrupted member. But so soone as the body it selfe became corrupted, then this rule and distinction failed. For which reason *Vincentius* makes a difference betweene a *Catholike* in place, and a *Catholike* in time. And euer when a *Catholike* in place is not a sure marke, he hath recourse vnto a *Catholike* in time. But (saith he) *if any new infection goes on, not onely to corrupt a part, but the whole Church, then must we cleane to antiquity.* So that the difference between the *Catholikes* and the *Huguenots*, lying in this point, Whether the body of the Church be corrupted or no? wee must not speake of the Church which is *Catholike* according to place, but according to time. And that Church is *Catholike* (saith *Vincentius*) which holds that religion which hath bene our hitherto embraced. And to discern which Religion hath bene alwayes embraced, when as the body of the Church, or the visible Church (as saith the same *Vincentius*) is corrupted; we must still haue recourse vnto Antiquity, and say with *Tertullian*, *Illud verum, quod primum*: That is truest which is ancientest. So as that is the *Catholike* Church, which agrees in faith with the more *Primitive* Church. So that if wee would discusse it, whether the *Catholikes* or the *Huguenots* be most properly the right *Catholikes*; wee must consider first

*Vincent. Lyr.
laduof. bar.*

*Eodem lib. adu.
barof.*

*Tertul. lib. de
praescript. adu.
barof.*

first, whether of them best holds of the faith of the Apostles: and next, of that of the ancient Doctors and Councils of the Church.

As for the title *Apostolike*, The Church may be called *Apostolike*, as well in regard of the *Writings* as of the *Preachings* of the Apostles. As for their *Writings*, those Churches which imbrace the doctrine delivered in them, are intituled *Apostolike*; yea, and more or lesse *Apostolike*, as they doe more or lesse agree, or disagree, to or from the said doctrine. So that the word *Apostolike* is all one with the word *Orthodox*, or with *Catholike*, taken in the last signification. And if the Church of the *Huguenots* may be entituled *Catholike* or *Orthodox*, they may also by the same reason be called *Apostolike*: nay & more properly *Apostolike* then *Catholike*. For the visible Church being (as I haue shewed) not absolutely, but comparatively, more or lesse *Catholike* or *Apostolike*, the *Huguenots*; though they may offend in default, and so be lesse *Catholike* rather, yet in this, they offend rather in the excess, and are too *Apostolike*: as being so strict, that they will readily beleue nothing, but what the Apostles haue written.

2
Apostolike. Secondly, those Churches were called *Apostolike*, which were instructed by the lively voice of the Apostles, and where the Apostles haue had their seats, as Ierusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Alexandria, &c. where the Apostles *Peter*, *James*, *John*, & *Marke* the Euangelist, sate, and are therefore from all Antiquity styled *Apostolicall Sees*, as well as Rome. Howbeit that this signification is rather an ornament, then a mark of a pure Church. For Antioch, Alexandria, and other Churches of Greece, where the Apostles preached, haue cyther altogether forsaken the name of Christ, or are at the least (according to the *Catholikes* Tenet) quite cut off for Schisme and Heresie, from the Communion of the true Church: & France, Spain, Poland, Germany, England, and Denmarke, where the Apostles neuer had any Bishopricks, haue sithence beene the true Churches. So that in this signification a Church may be pure, and yet not be *Apostolike*; and a Church which is *Apostolike* may be impure.

The last title, though first in estimation with the Catholiques, is that of *Roman*, which I haue obserued to haue beene taken in three seuerall sorts. First, the *Roman Church* is only taken for the Diocesse of *Rome*, and was in the beginning, for the Citie of *Rome* alone. As in *S. Pauls* time, who inscribed an Epistle seuerally to *Rome* alone, as he did likewise to those Churches of *Corinth*, *Ephesus*, *Galatia*, &c. For had the Church of *Rome* beene euery where at that time spread abroad, he had not needed to haue written to other Churches seuerally, because that in writing to that of *Rome*, he had then written to them all: And yet would our people needs make vse of this Epistle, to proue by it, The *Roman church* to be the catholique Church, because that in it, *S. Paul* saies, *Your faith is spread abroad in all the world*: as if *S. Paul* had not said the same to the Church of *Thessalonica*, *Your faith which you haue to God-ward is spread abroad*. But had the Church of *Rome* beene (as they would haue it) esteemed by *S. Paul* as all one with the Catholique, without doubt his Epistle to the *Romans* had beene intituled Catholique, as well as those of *S. Iohn*, *S. Peter*, *S. Iames*, and *S. Iude*, which are therefore stiled Catholique, for that they were written to the Catholique Church. Now taking the *Roman Church* in this signification, I confesse that not the *Huguenots* Churches alone are separated from the *Roman Church*, but all other catholique Churches besides: so that to this day they in *France* make a distinction of sundry customes of the *Roman Church*, and of the Church *Gallicane*.

Secondly, the Church of *Rome* is taken for the *Westerne Church*, inasmuch that the *Roman*, *Latine*, and *Occidental Church*, doth signifie one and the same thing, to distinguish it from the *Greeke* and *Easterne Church*, iust as the Empire of the East, and the Empire of the West, were called the Empires of *Rome* and of *Constantinople*, because that these two Cities were the chiefe seats of the Empire: and so by reason of the dignitie of the Citie of *Rome*, which was the seat of the Emperours that reigned in the West, all this *Westerne part*, was called the *Roman Empire*, and all the *Western Church* the *Roman Church*: that is to say, The Church contained vnder the *Roman Empire*. So then, if we call it the *Roman Church*, for distinguishing it from the *Greeke* and *Easterne Churches*, then also may the *Huguenots* Churches be members likewise of the *Roman Church*, for that they be *Westerne*, and not *Greeke*, nor *Easterne* Churches.

3.
How the *Huguenots* may
said to be of
the *Roman*
Church.

Rom. 1. 8.

1 Thess. 1. 8.

3.

Churches. If in respect of the *Roman* Empire, (taking the *Roman* Empire largely, as it was) they also be vnder the Empire, and by consequence, vnder the Church. But taking the Empire as it now is, then may the Churches of *Germanie*, some of which haue shak't off the Popes authority, be more properly stiled members of the *Roman* Church, than *Rome* it selfe; insomuch as *Germanie* and not *Rome*, is at this day called the *Roman* Empire.

Lastly, the *Roman* Church is vnderstood, for all those, that doe in Faith communicate with the Church of *Rome*: that is to say, those that be of the *Romish* Religion. I demand then their meaning, whether they vnderstand by the *Romish* Religion, those points in which the *Huguenots* doe agree with vs, or those wherein they disagree from vs, or both the one and the other.

If those points wherein they agree with vs, then they are directly of the *Roman* faith. If for the points only wherein they dissent, then are the beleefe in the Trinitie, and all the Articles of the three Creeds, of the Apostles, of *Nice*, and of *Athanasius*, wherein they doe agree, no Articles of the *Romish* Religion.

But if they take the *Roman* Religion, for all the points of it together, both for those wherein they doe agree, and all the other too; I demand once againe, whether so exact an agreement in all points, be required or not? And if not, then seeing that the points whereupon the *Huguenots* be agreed with the *Catholikes*, be for number more, and for importance greater, than those questions are, vpon which they disagree; they may yet neuertheless be repured to be of the *Roman* Church and Faith: forasmuch as things for the most part take their Denomination from the better part. Euen as we vse to say; those people are of a sanguine complexion, in whom bloud is predominant, although their temper be of other humours too. But if we affirme, that no man can be of this Church, vnlesse he beleeueth all, and the selfe-same, that the Church of *Rome* doth, then say I, that whilst we goe about to proue, that the *Huguenots* be not of our Church, we shall shew withall, that wee haue not any one man, who is absolutely of the Church: insomuch as that there is no one man, learned or vnlearned, that beleeueth all, iust as the Church doth.

For it is the credit of our Doctors, to maintaine singular opinions by themselves, which may be the reason why *Bellarmine*, the greatest

greatest Aduersarie to the *Huguenots*, accuses all the *Catholikes* that euer were before him, of Error, and those especially, which haue written against the *Huguenots*; as *Gensbrard*, *Pighini*, *Elvius*, *Hofius*, *Camus*, *Caietane*, *Scotus*, *Durand*, *S. Bonaventura*, *S. Thomas*, & *Damascone*: (for he spares not the Saints neither) the like courte-
 He also shewes herto the Antient Fathers, *S. Augustine*, *S. Bernard*, *S. Chrysostome*, and much adoe he hath to let *S. Paul* alone: So that amongst so many dissensions, either hath the Church beleueed nothing at all, or else hath the Church beleueed them altogether, that is to say, contradictions; or else that the Church hath beleueed but only some of them: and perchance, they haue all beleueed contrary to what the Church beleueeth.

Come we now to the common people, and they vnderstand not the one halfe part of that which we teach them: and when wee tell them of such points of Diuinity, wherein they were neuer brought vp; their fancies framing *Idea's* vnto themselves, vpon what they heare, make them conceiue *Chimera's* in their braines, and to beleuee the quite contrary to what the Church doth, before they are well aware of it.

But our *Catholikes* now haue found out a remedy for that; which is, *That an implicate Faith is enough for the common people*, which is as much to say, as to thinke only, & to beleuee only as the Church doth, though they doe not so indeed. So then, seeing that an implicate Faith is, To beleuee the contrary, and yet thinke they beleuee the same; if wee could but once perswade the *Huguenots*, that they doe verily beleuee as our Church of *Rome* doth in euery thing, although indeed they doe not, they shall be of our Church. See then, if I haue not taken a better method to conuert them, than any other *Catholikes* haue yet light vpon. They labour to conuert them to our explicite faith, which were to make them beleuee all the particulars of our Faith. And I, perceiuing them altogether incapable of this Explicite Faith, haue endeouored my selfe to make them embrace the Implicate Faith, which is much the easier of the two, and to perswade them to beleuee that they doe already beleuee, as our Church beleueeth: and consequently, that their Faith is the same, and their Church the same. That so by this perswasion they may proue, if not so good *Catholiques* as the Priests, yet at least, as good *Catholiques* as the people.

But to returne againe to my purpose; it appeares by what hath
 beene said, that if we stand for so strict an vnion in euery point,
 then will not the Catholiques themselves, neither learned nor un-
 learned, be of the *Roman Church*. Forasmuch as the learned will
 not beleeue as the rest doe, and the vnlearned cannot. And would
 we content our selues with an essentiall vnion, the *Huguenots* may
 then well be of it. Whereupon it followes, that we must
 needs yeeld to one of these; That either the *Hugue-
 notts* are of the *Roman Church*, or else that
 the *Catholikes* are not.

FINIS.